TALKS TO SUNDAY SCHOOL TEACHERS

LUTHER ALLAN WEIGLE

TALKS TO SUNDAY-SCHOOL TEACHERS

LUTHER ALLAN WEIGLE

TALKS TO SUNDAY-SCHOOL TEACHERS

BY

LUTHER ALLAN WEIGLE

HORACE BUSHNELL PROFESSOR OF CHRISTIAN NURTURE
YALE UNIVERSITY
AUTHOR OF "THE PUPIL AND THE TEACHER,"
"TRAINING THE DEVOTIONAL LIFE," ETC.

NEW YORK
GEORGE H. DORAN COMPANY

PRINTED IN THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

PREFACE

THIS book is in a sense a supplement to *The Pupil and the Teacher,* as it is my response to the request that I write in fuller and more concrete detail concerning certain topics briefly referred to in that book.

It has, however, a body of its own, and is published in the hope that parents and Sunday school teachers may be helped by these talks to gain further insight into the psychology of boys and girls and a better understanding of some of the pedagogical problems involved in their religious education. That it may be the better available for use by teacher-training or parents' classes, or as a basis for a series of Sunday school workers' conferences, questions for discussion and a brief bibliography are appended to each chapter.

Thanks are due for permission to publish in this form, to *The Teachers' Monthly, The Augsburg Sunday School Teacher, The Sunday School Worker, The Sunday School Magazine, The Pilgrim Magazine, The Evangelical Teacher,* and *The Pilgrim Elementary Teacher,* in which these articles originally appeared. I owe an especial acknowledgment to the Reverend J. M. Duncan,

D.D., Editor of the Sunday school publications of the Presbyterian Church in Canada, at whose request they were written.

CONTENTS

TALKS TO SUNDAY-SCHOOL TEACHERS

TALKS TO SUNDAY SCHOOL TEACHERS

CHAPTER I

THE CHILD AS A DISCOVERER

Who can tell what a baby thinks?
Who can follow the gossamer links
  By which the manikin feels his way
Out from the shore of the great unknown,
Blind, and wailing, and alone,
  Into the light of day?

What does he think of his mother's eyes?
  What does he think of his mother's hair?
What of the cradle-roof, that flies
  Forward and backward through the air?

TIMES have changed since J. G. Holland wrote those lines. Cradles are frowned upon, wailing is no longer regarded as an inevitable minor accompaniment, and psychology has actually begun to trace the "gossamer links." Yet one implication of the verses remains true. The child is a discoverer in what is to him a strange new world. Its paths are as uncharted as was the western sea for Columbus. Each day is a voyage in exploration. Things matter-of-course to older folk tingle with newness to

him; facts that the world has long known he must learn for himself.

Nature has equipped him for it. Curiosity is one of the earliest, as it is one of the most permanent, of the human instincts. The normal child is a born adventurer. He is so built that he cannot remain politely inert in the presence of things that appeal to his senses. He is not only all eyes and ears, he is all hands and feet and restless activity as well. Just to have sensations is, as Professor Thorndike puts it, one of the natural satisfiers of human nature, and quite as natural is the instinct to be doing something with them. Mental emptiness, sheer inactivity, irk us all. The child is bound to react to his sensations with the demand for more. And he does not passively await their coming; he pushes out in whatever ways his little body will permit to seek new experiences.

Curiosity begins, perhaps, with the baby's stare, as early often as the second week. Miss Shinn tells, with approval, of her grandmother's rule, that you should never needlessly interrupt a baby's staring lest you hinder the development of the power of attention. Soon surprise and wonder appear, to be followed, as the little muscles permit, by active observation, experiment and play.

I remember watching a boy of eight months sit for what seemed a long time, just picking up a block from the floor and putting it down again, each time a little farther out, till he reached his limit and hitched along to begin again. It was the simplest sort of play, yet he was acquiring muscular control,

not only of hand and arm, but of his whole body; he was developing space-perception and coördination of eye and hand, and he was learning some of the properties of blocks and floors.

What an impossible task his education would be, were he not so made as to respond with action, with interest and experiment, to a sense-stimulus,—were he simply to sit like a lump of putty, waiting to have parent or teacher fold his little fingers around that block, stretch out his arm for him and seek to direct his lagging eye! What is true of so simple a bit of baby play is true throughout the whole of childhood. The child's physical activity, his constant play, his eager observation and experiment are the instruments of development and discovery.

The child's activity may, of course, become annoying. We may be impelled to command quiet for our nerves' sake, or for his sake may put a stop to play too prolonged or too venturesome. It is but to be expected that the little investigator's experiments may at times be unwise, destructive, cruel or even dangerous. Children will taste anything, and they have no way of telling poison from food, or colic-producers from wholesome fruits. They will take anything to pieces that they can get apart; and the more hidden the mechanism of a toy, the greater the challenge to their spirit of discovery. One toy that we have never been able to keep whole in our house, though we have bought several, is a "come back" cylinder that bears no hint whatever of mech-

anism on its surface, but mysteriously insists on rolling back to you when you start it rolling away.

Smith and Hall tell of a little girl who cried bitterly after she had spoiled her doll by poking in its eyes, not because it was ruined, but because, she tearfully explained, "Now I can't ever find out what makes dolly shut her eyes. Won't you buy me another one so I can find out?" Like curiosity leads to such apparently cruel acts as forcing open the eyes of little kittens, breaking chickens' legs to learn how to mend them, or dissecting frogs to see how they are put together. One boy is reported who, at the time when a scientific man's experiment in fasting was much talked of, shut up his pet squirrel to see how long it would live without food. Warnings of pain to himself, even, will not deter the little experimenter sometimes; he will try the forbidden thing and deliberately bring on the pain, to see how it feels.

The getting of experiences, however, is but the beginning of the young discoverer's adventure. He must explore their relations as well; he is not content till he understands his experiences. Man is, as Carlyle put it, a cause-hunting animal. Very early indeed, the child begins to compare things with one another, to observe likenesses, differences, connections, and sequences, to draw conclusions and to seek causes. To sensory curiosity is added rational curiosity. And to play, observation and experiment as methods of discovery, he adds questions put to his elders—infinitely many and of all sorts: What? Why? How? What for? Where from? What

makes it? Who made it? What does so-and-so mean?

Examples need not be cited. We have all had to meet children's questions. They are at times aimless and random, the product not of real curiosity so much as of fatigue or peevishness,—the endless repetition of "Why?" questions is often of this type. But most often they reveal how puzzling to children are things that we take for granted, and how well the little investigators can reason with the data at their command. Professor Sully tells of a boy not yet four who asked, "Why don't we see two things with our two eyes?" and of another just past that age who inquired, "What is the good of bees?" When told that they make honey, he responded with the pertinent query, "Then do they bring it for us to eat?" R——, aged five, came home from a kindergarten class where he had been told of the earth's shape and motion, eager to have it explained: "Why don't we fall off when the world is moving so fast?"

That children should ask hard questions about things metaphysical and theological is to be expected. They are deeply interested in origins, in birth and death, and in the God whom they cannot see and about whom we tell them so falteringly. Their reasoning here too is often surprisingly direct and sound. Sully tells about a boy of four who asked, "If I had gone upstairs, could God make it that I hadn't?" and about another of seven who asked, "Why doesn't God kill the devil, and then there would be no more wickedness in the world?" R——, aged five, rummaging about at his grand-

mother's, found an old book about the Johnstown flood, and insisted on having the story. He astonished his Sunday-school teacher some months later by stoutly maintaining that God broke his promise to Noah, about which she was telling them—"How about the Johnstown flood?" "But, dear, God didn't send that; men made that dam such that it broke." "Yes," he replied, "but God sent the rain that made it break."

It is the privilege of us older folk to protect and guide the little discoverer, to foster rather than to repress his eager spirit of investigation, to provide materials for educative play, observation and experiment, and out of our larger experience so to answer his questions that he will be led to that knowledge of truth that makes men free.

FOR INVESTIGATION AND DISCUSSION

1. Give examples which have come under your observation of children's play motived by curiosity or the desire to experiment. Of constructive play. Of destructiveness.

2. What sort of toys would you suggest for children to encourage inventiveness and foster the spirit of inquiry, yet not encourage destructiveness?

3. Give some examples of children's questions which are hard to answer. How would you answer these questions?

4. Name some possible harmful results of a policy of repression such as "Keep still," "Don't ask foolish questions," etc.

5. The opportunity which children's curiosity affords

to the teacher, and ways in which the teacher may stimulate and use it.

FOR FURTHER READING

The article by Smith and Hall is entitled "Curiosity and Interest," and is found in G. S. HALL: "Aspects of Child Life and Education." Other articles are H. W. BROWN: "Some Records of the Thought and Reasonings of Children," *Pedagogical Seminary,* II, pp. 358-396, and H. L. CLAPP: "The Educative Value of Children's Questions," *Popular Science Monthly,* XLIX, pp. 799-809. JAMES SULLY: "Studies of Childhood" has a body of concrete material, interpreted by a great psychologist. A thoroughly scientific statement of the facts is found in E. L. THORNDIKE: "The Original Nature of Man," which is followed by NORSWORTHY and WHITLEY: "The Psychology of Childhood."

CHAPTER II

A BUNDLE OF INSTINCTS

THE little human animal, like every other, is born *going*. He is already wound up. His lungs expand and contract; his heart is pumping away; his stomach is ready to handle food. These organic, vital activities he does not initiate. They begin themselves. The organism possesses them by nature. They are the very condition of life.

There are many other activities, not so obviously vital as these, for which nature winds him up quite as thoroughly—yes, and sets him to go off at the proper time for each. He will suck when brought to the breast as unfailingly as his lungs will begin to work upon contact with the air. He will cry from hunger or discomfort, clasp anything that touches his fingers or toes, carry to his mouth whatever he can grasp, in time smile when smiled at, later grow afraid when left alone or in the dark, manifest anger and affection, walk, run, play, question, imitate, collect things, pull things apart, put them together again, take pleasure in being with friends, act shy before strangers, find a chum, belong to a "gang" or "bunch," quarrel, fight, become reconciled, and some day fall in love with one of the opposite sex. These, and many more, are just his

natural human ways. He does not *of purpose* initiate them any more than he initiates breathing or heartbeat. He does these things because he is so born and built. They are his instincts.

The child cannot do all these things at birth, of course. Each instinct manifests itself in its own time, as he grows and develops and meets the situations that call it forth. The point is that he does not need to be introduced to any of these modes of behavior or have it started for him. He will just naturally find himself doing it some day, likely without knowing why. He inherits these tendencies as part of the native organization of his nervous system. It is so made that inevitably certain situations call forth these characteristic responses.

The instincts of many animals low in the scale of life are marvelously complete. They provide for a complex series of actions that fit, with mechanical precision, the details of certain situations in which the animal is placed. Lloyd Morgan tells of a beetle that lays its eggs near the entrance to the galleries of a mason bee. These are hatched out as active larvæ, which in the spring fasten themselves to the bodies of the bee-drones as they pass from the galleries. There they cling till the nuptial flight of the bees, when as the insects mate they pass from the body of the drone to that of the female bee. Again they wait until the female lays her eggs; then they spring into the cells and consume eggs and honey while undergoing the metamorphoses which issue finally in their becoming perfect beetles. This series of actions, it is plain, could never be learned

by imitation, or taught by one beetle to another. It is done only once in the lifetime of each beetle; and it must at that time be done perfectly, else the beetle will not live. The instinct in this case is precise and complete; it is what Herbert Spencer called a "compound reflex." Every detail in the series is provided for, and takes place as mechanically and naturally as the action of heart or lungs in us.

Our human instincts are not so detailed or complete. The rule seems to be that animals are cared for by nature plus parents. When parents do nothing, nature does all; but when parents can or ought to be depended upon, nature leaves much to them. The little beetle never sees its mother or father, or even knows that it has any: its instincts therefore provide for its welfare in so wonderfully complete a way. The human baby, on the other hand, receives years of devoted parental care and its instincts are correspondingly vague and indefinite. It never could survive if left to itself.

The point is not that the human instincts retreat in the face of parental endeavor or that they abdicate to reason. It is simply that they are large and rough-hewn, with many details left blank; they lack the precision and completeness that the instincts of some lower animals possess. Instinct leads the bee to build a honeycomb, and provides for both material and pattern; it leads the bird to build a nest, and the beaver a dam, with less of specific direction; it impels the child to constructive play, but what and how the child shall build, it does not determine. Instinct leads the squirrel to collect nuts; it impels

the child to collect—almost anything. Human instincts do not so much provide particular things to do, as impel to general types of action or feeling. The details are left to be filled in by parental training and by experience. Often they provide simply the innate capacity for some line of action or study, or the predisposition to some type of emotion.

This indefinite character of our innate tendencies makes possible their application to an infinitely wider variety of situations than could be met by instincts of a more mechanical sort. Unless the beetle chances to meet just the precise condition for which its instinct fits it, it will perish. But man, once given the protection infancy requires, is able to meet wholly new situations and conquer adverse circumstance. His instincts are capable of intelligent adaptation.

The fact is that intelligence and self-control, reason and will, grow and develop *within* our instincts, rather than outside of them. No instinct, once used, is after that as vague and indefinite as it was before. It has added two things to itself, a habit and an idea. Because it has this time acted in some definite way, it will tend thereafter to work that way again, in accord with the law of habit. And because its action has issued in some consciously experienced result, the idea of that result remains and will help to guide future action. The natural tendency need no longer be followed blindly. Every time that an instinct is used, therefore, it becomes more definite and more intelligent. The mature man, if he has lived rightly, has come to understand his instincts;

they have grown into habits, sentiments, principles and ideals, and each has fallen into its place in a rational unity of personal life.

The child stands at the beginning of this process of development. He is a little bundle of instincts which he does not yet understand, and of which he is not master. The one thing certain is that he will respond with action to the world about him rather than with mere contemplation, and that his actions will conform in a general way to the inherited human type. He will do the same sort of things that children have done for centuries before him, and will likely do for centuries to come. Here, then, is our opportunity and responsibility as parents and teachers. We do not need to wind children up to get them to do things; they are already going. We do need to furnish the right material and stimulus, and to observe and guide their natural reactions. These instincts form the starting-point for all education and control. Some native tendencies we shall seek to preserve and perpetuate; some we shall do our best to get rid of; many we shall seek to modify or redirect. But, in any case, we shall succeed just in so far as we begin by understanding what nature has put there in the first place.

FOR INVESTIGATION AND DISCUSSION

1. What is meant by instinct as a characteristic of human beings? Make out the best list that you can of human instincts, and classify them if possible. Compare the lists

and classifications of Kirkpatrick, McDougall and Thorndike.

2. In what respects are human instincts like, and in what respects unlike, the instincts of animals?

3. What is the relation of human instincts to habits, ideas and ideals?

4. Methods of control and education of human instincts.

5. Why is it essential that parents and teachers should understand and enlist the instincts of children?

FOR FURTHER READING

WILLIAM JAMES: the chapter on "Instincts" in "Principles of Psychology"; E. A. KIRKPATRICK: "Fundamentals of Child Study"; WILLIAM MCDOUGALL: "An Introduction to Social Psychology"; E. L. THORNDIKE: "The Original Nature of Man" and "Education."

CHAPTER III

CHILDREN'S "LIES"

"ALL Cretans are liars" was an old-world proverb that found its way even into the Bible. There are those who would have us think that children are like Cretans in that respect. Perez thought that he could notice, even from the cradle, "signs of an innate disposition to concealment, to dissimulation, to ruse." Montaigne held that "falsehood grows as fast as children do."

Much depends, of course, on what we mean by a lie. Conscious falsehoods, told with intent to deceive, are no more natural for children than they ought to be for grown-ups. But misstatements, exaggerations, fancies mixed with facts, are both common and natural. In general, these are not to be taken as evidence of moral delinquency or of hereditary taint. They may show simply that the child has not yet succeeded in straightening out his experiences, or that he does not fully understand his obligation to speak the truth.

Sincerity is natural, both for children and for grown-ups who have not been spoiled. But no human instinct prevents error, or prompts one without fail to tell the truth. The difference between fact and not-fact has to be learned; the ideal and the

habit of truth-telling are acquired in the course of experience, through education and training.

1. *Imaginative lies.* Many, perhaps most, of the lies of younger children result from their confusion of imagination and reality. The boundary line between fact and fancy, to us older folk so clear, is very vague for them. Indeed, they begin with no line at all. There is no intrinsic difference between a bit of imagination and the sensation of which it is the reproduction. The image may be as vivid, clear and coercive as its archetype. Dreams may have every semblance of reality. The difference becomes manifest only in their contexts. The sensation is linked up with other experiences in a consistent and coherent order; the image is somewhere inconsistent with the experiences that go before and after it. Reality has no breaks; but dreams are bound somewhere to break with reality, if only when we wake to find ourselves in bed. Have a dream that links itself in memory with a previous dream or two, and you may find yourself at a loss to know whether you dreamed it or it actually happened.

Now a little child is often in somewhat this state of confusion. At first, he lacks entirely a basis upon which to mark off imagination from reality. He takes his mental images at face value; they are as real to him as sensations. He has not had experience enough to discriminate the probable from the improbable, the consistent and coherent from the wild and fanciful. The imagined bear behind the door stirs him to fear as readily and as really as the actual dog that jumps out to bark at him. Only

gradually, as knowledge grows and widens, does he come to realize the difference between those experiences that "hang together" and "stay put" (and hence are real), and those other experiences whose contexts are so shifting and uncertain as to betray their imaginary character. The child's ability to discriminate fact from fancy develops slowly, and depends always upon the amount and kind of experience that he has had. Many a misstatement is honest enough a product of his own lack of clearness at this point.

There is sound psychology, therefore, in the familiar story of the little girl who, having insisted that there was a lion in the front yard, was ordered by her mother to go upstairs and to ask God to forgive her for lying. In a few minutes she returned happily with the news: "God said, 'Never you mind, Mary, that big dog pretty near fooled me too.'" Mrs. Fisher tells of a little girl who was thrown into a panic of fear at the sight of her father masquerading as a giant, in spite of the fact that he had explained everything to her beforehand and had shown her the costume he was to wear. "I *knew* it was just father," she explained when she recovered; "I *knew* that, but I thought it *might* be a giant."

2. *Suggested lies.* Imaginative lies are often suggested to children. Sully reports a child who, being asked by his mother who had told him something, answered "Dolly." Her question put into his mind the idea that some one had told him, and there was the doll which was his constant playmate—what

more natural than that his imagination should seize upon the doll as the source of his information? A child of three, seeing a cough syrup that she liked being administered to another child, asked for some, claiming to be sick too and pretending to cough. No grown-up who feels like coughing when he hears some one else cough can deny the probability that this was not so much conscious deception as suggested illusion. L——, aged three, when he hears some one relate an especially interesting experience, is likely forthwith to repeat it as having happened to himself, without the least trace of shame and with complete disregard of the fact that everybody knows that it did not.

3. *Lies of exaggeration.* Children incline naturally to put things strongly, entirely aside from any ulterior motive to do so. Their narratives of real occurrences are likely to have more of color and contrast than was actually there. They generalize readily and somewhat recklessly. Their speech runs easily to plurals. In all of which, of course, they are not so very much unlike many adults.

4. *Play lies.* The lies of which we have thought thus far are believed, or at least more than half believed, by the children who tell them. What may be called play lies are not so believed, though they may be quite as innocent. They include the make-believe of dramatic play, where the child is conscious of playing a part; lies told to tease or shock or surprise some one else; and pretended secrets. R——, aged five, from time to time meets his father with some story of his own brave deed or

tragic mishap, only to end up after a little while with: "But I didn't really, daddy; I just wanted to see what you would say."

5. *Lies of self-interest.* More serious are the lies that children tell in self-interest, or for self-protection or self-defense. For them, as for older persons, the lie may be a means to the gratification of selfish ends, or a ready refuge in time of trouble. It is possible that our very measures of discipline, if too stern and unyielding, may drive them to lie. When I asked R—— the other day what was the cause of some trouble in the playroom, he wanted to know whether it would be safe for him to tell the truth: "But, daddy, will you spank me if I tell you what I did?"

6. *Lies of rivalry and boasting.* "To put up a front" seems natural to all ages. All who have read "Tom Sawyer" will remember Mark Twain's characteristic description of Tom and the new boy in town picking a fight, each threatening the other with the vengeance of a non-existent big brother. Hall and Smith, in their study of "showing off," give many examples of lies of this type. One child boasted that she had had a fever so high that it cracked the doctor's thermometer; another, that he was going to have a thousand dollars to spend on the day when the show came to town. A pathetic "front" is that of the little Fresh-air Fund child, who told her hosts that her father rode around in a carriage with a span of horses—the truth being that her father drove an ice-wagon. "Oh, that's nothing," retorted one in answer to another's tale of good

fortune; "I went to Mexico last summer, and at the place where I was all I had to do was to pick up all the diamonds I could carry. Some of them were blue and some of them were red. I have a blue one home, as big as a hickorynut."

7. *Privileged lies.* Many children conceive their obligation to speak the truth to depend upon personal relations. The truth is due, they feel, to father and mother, to friends and chums; but not to those to whom they are bound by no such ties of mutual confidence and good-will. It is one's privilege to lie to enemies, strangers or mere acquaintances. When I reproved R—— one day for teasing a maid, putting it on the ground that he might make her feel badly, he replied, "Well, she doesn't belong to our family." This tendency is fostered by well-meaning parents and teachers who put all emphasis upon the children's personal relation to themselves, to the neglect of the development of right ideals of impartial honesty, justice and truth.

8. *Lies to do good.* Older children, who have come to understand what truth is, are yet often ready to justify a lie provided it be told to do good to some one else. In their own practical experience, this generally means a lie told to help some other child escape blame or punishment: theoretically, they will bring to mind, like many older reasoners than they, such cases as lies to save reputation, or property, or life, the physician's lie to help his patient, and the like. Older folk foster this tendency by the opprobrium that many so undiscriminatingly put upon tale-bearing. There are many grown-up

people whose ideas concerning their own behavior, as well as concerning the training of children, are unclear and confused at this point.

9. *Lies of mental reservation.* Older children will at times appease their consciences when lying by making inaudible reservations, such as "maybe," "in my mind," "over the left," "nit," "don't you think it," "I don't mean it." They ignore the fact that these are not open to the person to whom the lie is told, and regard their duty to the truth as fulfilled by what takes place within their own minds. Sometimes such palliating mental reservations are annexed to promises which the child really intends to fulfill, as a sort of prudent provision for a possible future desire to break them.

Children have odd little oaths of their own, formulas of affirmation which they offer and accept as guaranties of the truth of a statement. Small, in his study on "The Instinct for Certainty," has collected many of these, such as: "Honest"; "Really and truly"; "Honor bright"; "Cross my heart"; "Hope to die"; "Sure as you live"; "Honest and true, black and blue, lay me down and cut me in two."

To deal with children's lies requires sympathy and patience. There is no one prescription.

Certainly we must not lie to them in return. A parent who came seeking counsel as to how to deal with his little daughter's falsehoods, reported that he had told her among other things that if she did not stop lying a great big dragon-fly ("devil's darn-

ing-needle") would come some day and sting her so that she would die!

We must first of all diagnose our case. We must understand what sort of lies the child is telling, and try to discover why. And then we should set to work patiently to train him to observe and describe things as they are, to help him to bound off fact from fancy, to lead him to understand what truth is and why it is the basis of all social relations, and to beget within him the ideal and the habit of sincerity and straightforwardness.

Above all, we shall ourselves both tell and live the truth. That means that we shall be consistent as well as sincere with our children, and that we shall be careful not to make hasty or indifferent promises, which we shall afterward forget or break on the score of some consideration which we deem to be more important, but which the child cannot appreciate. Some one has well said that the fundamental matter here is not so much what the parents' motives really are, as what they seem to the child to be.

It is a mistake to use soft and ambiguous terms for a lie, such as "fib" or "story." Children should be brought up to recognize and reverence truth as truth and to think of any conscious deviation from the truth in word or deed as a lie. Professor F. C. Sharp in his "Education for Character" well defines a lie as "an attempt to create in another person a belief which we ourselves do not hold." Even little children can understand the spirit of that definition. The softer terms are mischievous just be-

cause they tend to blur it over. The word "story" is particularly objectionable because of its constant use in its primary sense to denote imaginative tales or narratives of fact. "Tell me a story" is the eager and oft-repeated request of every child who knows what it is to climb on father's knee or into mother's lap. What confusion then must reign in his little mind if that same father or mother forbids him to tell stories.

"But," some fond mother will object, "I cannot bring myself to call my little girl a liar." Certainly not, but that is not our counsel. There is a great difference between telling a lie and being a liar. For the first word refers to a single act, and the second to a settled disposition of character. Most children tell lies at some time or other; very few of them are liars.

In some families and schools, children are so unwisely dealt with that they are actually tempted to lie. They are constantly asked incriminating questions; they are without discrimination branded as tale-bearers if they tell the truth about any one other than themselves; they are prohibited from asking freely for what they want; they are forced to offer apologies and to pay compliments which they do not feel; they are punished according to the letter of the law for every misdeed, without regard to the innocence of their intent or the honesty of their confession. All these are ways of tempting, even of training children to lie. It is bad, moreover, for a home or a social group of any sort to permit

many secrets among its members. Every secret is pregnant with temptations to lie.

Finally, we should see to it, in so far as we can, that the child's lies do not pay. As long as he can "get away with them" and by lying gain immunity or personal advantage, he is thereby encouraged to lie. Children should be brought early to realize that the way of the transgressor, in this respect, is hard. Punishments of an arbitrary sort will not do this. One cannot scare a child into truthfulness. The appeal to fear is likely but to render him more ready, in any hard situation, to seek refuge in a lie. But punishments that are naturally and logically connected with the offense will help him to understand the weakness and worthlessness of lying. The best punishments, in general, are those that foreshorten and materialize the inevitable moral consequences of the wrong deed. In case of lying, this principle means that we should rely for the most part upon such punishments as will beget within the child's mind a sense of the lack of confidence in himself and in his word, which is the natural result of his readiness to lie. At the same time, we must be sure to leave open to the child a way of salvation, and to hold before his mind the possibility of his reinstatement in the confidence of ourselves and others.

FOR INVESTIGATION AND DISCUSSION

1. What is a lie? Compare your definition with Professor Sharp's.
2. Give examples of children's lies which have come

under your observation, and classify them according to the text. Do you find some which you cannot classify under these headings?

3. May parents unintentionally encourage children to lie? How?

4. The problem of tale-bearing, in its relation to truth-telling.

5. How would you deal with lies of each of the several types described in the chapter?

6. How would you punish lying?

7. Should a child who has done wrong be punished if he confesses the truth?

FOR FURTHER READING

Good articles are by G. S. HALL: "Children's Lies," in *Pedagogical Seminary,* I, pp. 211-218; N. OPPENHEIM: "Why Children Lie," *Popular Science Monthly,* XLVII, pp. 372-387; E. P. ST. JOHN: "Veracity," *Pedagogical Seminary,* XV, pp. 246-270. F. C. SHARP formulates an exceedingly suggestive list of questions in "Education for Character," pp. 302-306. W. H. WINCH: "Children's Perceptions" gives the results of experiments upon children's power to observe with accuracy. Discussions of the general moral problem are R. L. STEVENSON: "Virginibus Puerisque," pp. 68-86, and R. E. SPEER: "The Marks of a Man," chapter I.

CHAPTER IV

A BOY'S LOYALTY

WHAT do we mean by loyalty? Patriotism was one's first answer in the days of war. In home and workshop, on farm and railway, as well as in camp and trench, on sea and in the air, the nation called us, every one, to service.

Not all loyalty is in war time, however; nor is one's country the only object to inspire it. In his wonderful little book, "The Philosophy of Loyalty," Professor Royce defines loyalty as "the willing and practical and thoroughgoing devotion of a person to a cause." He cites as an example of such loyalty the Speaker of the British House of Commons, who, when King Charles I, seeking to arrest certain of its members, inquired whether he espied them, answered, "Your Majesty, I am the Speaker of this House, and, being such, I have neither eyes to see nor tongue to speak save as this House shall command."

To do one's full duty, then, to live up to one's job, to serve one's cause, whatever it be, in wholehearted, unswerving fidelity, is loyalty. We think of Paul,—"This one thing I do"; of Lincoln's letter to Horace Greeley, "My paramount object in this struggle is to save the Union, and is not either to

save or to destroy slavery"; of the engineer who seeks to the last to avert or temper the collision which may cost him his life; of the telephone girls and wireless operators who, in the face of sudden disaster, remain at their instruments, to send out warnings and appeals; of the captain in stricken Halifax who fought and conquered the fire upon a second munition ship which had been deserted by its crew. We think, too, of the countless ordinary folk, fathers and mothers, preachers, teachers, professional and business men, clerks and workmen, who, in quiet devotion, live and serve each in his own way. Loyalty is not always, or even often, spectacular. It is an every-day virtue. It underlies all real achievement; it is the substance of all good character. To be loyal is to serve the ideal, whatever the field in which that service may lie.

Besides loyalty to country and loyalty to duty there is another sort,—loyalty to persons. It is the loyalty of trust and affection, begotten in intimate personal relation or in the more or less distant admiration of hero-worship. It is the loyalty of lovers, of friends, of parent and child, of teacher and pupil, of leader and follower.

Loyalty is a natural human virtue. Its roots may be traced far back in the life of childhood. Children's affection for others; their desire to help; their instinct to protect and care for dolls, animal pets and younger children; their obedience; their idealizing imagination; their growing interest in constructive activities; their developing patience, persistence and self-control;—these are the beginnings of loy-

alty. Just beginnings, of course; and beginnings that may be turned and modified to almost any sort of end. The roots of loyalty are natural; the quality of their fruit is determined by cultivation, or by the lack of it. Much, I had almost said everything, depends upon us older folk. It is our business, in dealing with early and middle childhood, not to appeal to or try to use a loyalty not yet developed, nor to seek to awaken loyalty before its basis is laid in experience, but rather to cultivate in the child such habits and ideals as may enter helpfully into the development of the loyalty that is to be.

In later childhood and early adolescence loyalty blossoms forth in rich promise. From ten to sixteen is the age of spontaneous social organizations, such as clubs and "gangs." Boys no longer play alone, or with older folk; they seek companions of their own age, and go about in bunches. Their games call for team play, with its coöperation and its subordination of the individual to the good of the whole. They formulate their own laws, formally or informally, and have their own code of honor. Each group constitutes a social unit whose members are bound in mutual loyalty. They will stand by one another through thick and thin, and they will stand by the ideals embodied in their code. They will keep their word in strictest fidelity, to one another and to those whom the group recognizes as friends and "square"; and they will not "squeal" though the heavens fall. Loyalty is the gang's fundamental virtue; disloyalty is the unpardonable sin which leads inevitably to expulsion.

In his most interesting, if somewhat extreme book, "The Boy and His Gang," Puffer holds that we must look upon the gang as nature's training school for the social virtues. "Only by associating himself with other boys can any youth learn the knack of getting on with his fellow men; acquire and practice coöperation, self-sacrifice, loyalty, fidelity, team play; and in general prepare himself to become the efficient citizen of a democracy. Nature has given the boy the gang instincts for the sake of making easy for him the practice of the gang virtues."

It is a crucial time in the boy's moral development. He is reaching beyond the life of the home into that of school and play-ground, forest, field and city street. At no time does adult influence seem to count for so little, just because his new friendships count for so much. He cares more for what the fellows do and say than for what older folk think. He is beginning to take the ordering of life into his own hands, and is guided by such public opinion as is open to him. The father and mother who fail to recognize this function of the boy's friendships, who, impatient and unsympathetic, simply "put their foot down," stand pat on the rules and precepts of childhood, and try to keep their boy "tied to his mother's apron-strings," only engender a conflict of loyalties within him, in which the home loyalties are very likely to lose out.

That does not mean, however, that it is the part of wisdom simply to let boys go their own way in these "gang" years. Something very like that has been proposed by certain advocates of the so-called

recapitulation theory, which asserts that the development of the individual recapitulates in brief the stages through which the development of the race has passed. Until eight or nine, they hold, the child is essentially non-social; in the gang age, his instincts and impulses are those of primitive man. And we are asked to believe that the surest way to get rid of what is undesirable in these impulses, and to promote a healthy, normal development, is just to let them have their fling for a few years. The mischief of boyhood, so runs the theory, is cathartic; it is nature's way of getting the ancestral poison out of the boy's system.

This is dangerous pedagogy. Exercise is far more likely to fix than to eliminate undesirable tendencies. The law of habit none can doubt or escape; but the principle of catharsis, I believe, exists chiefly in the imagination of its advocates.

We shall neither repress the gang, then, nor let it go its own way; we shall seek to understand and enlist it. Its virtues are sound, but they stand in need of enlightenment and expansion. Its code of honor is to be respected, however inadequate it may seem to our larger experience. Its group loyalty is to be fostered and directed, for the sake of the larger loyalties that are yet to be.

We must help the boy to grow in loyalty, to incorporate older loyalties into new, lesser loyalties into greater. We must help him pass from loyalties which are personal merely, to those which involve devotion to causes and ideals, impartial, impersonal and eternal in their worth. We must help him to

practice loyalty, and to understand that real loyalty is never mere enthusiasm, red fire, speeches or even heroic acts; but that it is rather a steady, thoroughgoing habit of devotion to whatever one has undertaken to do in the world. Much of this help we can only begin to give in the "gang" years, for a large part of the boy's education in loyalty will take place in later adolescence and in young manhood, as he faces the responsibilities of mature life. Who of us, indeed, could say that his own education in loyalty has yet been finished?

FOR INVESTIGATION AND DISCUSSION

1. Describe some cases which have come under your observation which prove that loyalty is an everyday virtue.
2. Describe some of the games which help to cultivate loyalty. Discuss the importance of organized games and their bearing upon loyalty.
3. Discuss the advantages and disadvantages of the gang. What should be the relation of parents and teachers to the spontaneous social life of boys?
4. Is it possible for a boy to become too loyal to certain causes or to certain friends? How can you as parent or teacher help him to develop larger, truer loyalties.
5. The recapitulation theory, and its validity. What is the principle of catharsis in pedagogy, and what do you think of its truth?

FOR FURTHER READING

Josiah Royce: "The Philosophy of Loyalty" is a book which every teacher ought to know. J. A. Puffer: "The

Boy and His Gang" and W. B. FORBUSH: "The Boy Problem" give concrete studies of boy-life at this age. The recapitulation theory and the principle of catharsis may be found stated in G. S. HALL: "Adolescence," and criticized in E. L. THORNDIKE: "The Original Nature of Man," pp. 245-282, and G. A. COE: "A Social Theory of Religious Education," chapter 12.

CHAPTER V

THE AGE OF HERO WORSHIP

IT was early October on a mid-western gridiron, and between halves of the first big game of the season. My neighbor on the bleachers, a boy of thirteen or fourteen, turned eagerly toward me. "Say, I wish I knew what the Harvard score is by this time." "Harvard?" I answered, surprised. "What do you know about Harvard? I thought you were a rooter for our team right here." "I am, sir; but, you see, Jack Knox is playing for Harvard this year."

Then I remembered. Jack Knox had been the star player of the local team of two seasons past. He had gone to Harvard for graduate study, and would now, so far as a year's residence was concerned, be eligible for the Harvard team. I began to question my seatmate. How did he know that Jack Knox would play that day on the Harvard team? He did not know, it came out; and he had not stopped to think that perhaps Knox would not try for the Harvard team, or that he might not make it if he did. "Jack Knox could make any team in the world, sir. Sure, you know that. Remember that slide-off-tackle play of his? Remember that time he made the touchdown with two tacklers hang-

ing to him for the last ten yards? Remember . . ." and on he went, till he had given me a pretty complete history of the athletic career of Jack Knox, and what seemed like an exhaustive catalogue of his virtues.

I had uncovered a bit of hero worship. Jack Knox was to me a good football player, a clean-cut wholesome fellow, and a student of fair ability; but to this youngster he was a hero. I kept quietly in touch with the boy that fall. Week after week the Harvard scores appeared in the paper, but never Jack Knox's name as a member of the team. Yet his faith in his hero was never shaken; and one day he met me triumphantly. "Say, did you know why Jack Knox is not playing for Harvard this year? I got one of the college boys to write and ask him; and he says that they don't allow graduate students to play. Huh—I should think they wouldn't! The graduate students would be too good for the rest of them, I guess—at least, Jack Knox would be." The boy's interest in Harvard was over; but I fancied, four years later, when I watched him, now a freshman, begin his own battle for a place on the college team, that I could detect some of Jack Knox's old-time form.

We are all hero worshipers—or ought to be. Carlyle was right; that age is decadent that has no heroes. Yet there is generally something of reserve about the hero worship of us grown-ups. We do not quite let ourselves go. We are too sensible of the complexity of situations, motives and characters. Our worship is sophisticated. We analyze our he-

roes. We prize their qualities; we reverence their ideals; we distinguish between the men themselves and their causes, and our loyalty is to the cause rather than to the man. We are even ready to admit that in some respects they had or have faults.

The hero worship of later childhood and early adolescence, however, is unreserved and wholehearted. The boy is unskilled in psychological analysis. He knows little of motives or causes. He yields complete devotion to the man who can do something better than anybody else. Achievement catches his eye, challenges his admiration, creates his heroes. His ideal is the man who *can*.

Some interesting studies of children's ideals have been made, usually by asking school children to write compositions on such subjects as, "What person would you most like to resemble, and why?" or, "What do you want to be when you grow up, and why?" As a whole, these studies exhibit certain general trends.

(1) Younger children derive their ideals from their immediate acquaintances; but as they get older, they tend increasingly to derive them from the great characters of history and the leaders of contemporary life. In Miss Darrah's study,[1] 47 per cent of the seven-year-old children are reported as finding their ideals in father or mother, neighbor or friend, 39 per cent in literature, and 14 per cent in history. But there is a steady change of relation with increasing age, till at sixteen years, 80 per cent of the children's ideals are historical, 12 per cent from litera-

[1] *Popular Science Monthly*, Vol. 53, pages 88, 89 (May, 1898).

ture, and only 8 per cent acquaintances. Historical characters, in this study, include contemporary makers of history; and it is significant that an increasing number of these are chosen as the children get older.

Chambers, in another study,[1] separated past from contemporary characters. His figures are: acquaintance ideals diminish from 78 per cent at six years to 5 per cent at sixteen; ideals from past history increase from 7 per cent at six years to 61 per cent at eleven, then gradually drop to 48 per cent at sixteen; ideals from contemporary history increase steadily from 9 per cent at six years to 19 per cent at eleven, then more rapidly to 39 per cent at sixteen.

(2) Girls, as well as boys, tend to choose male ideals. Very few boys choose women as their ideals, and these mostly the younger boys; but Miss Darrah found that 45 per cent of the seven-year-old girls whom she studied chose male ideals, and that this proportion increased until at fourteen and fifteen years, 67 per cent chose a man as their ideal.

(3) As reasons for the choice of an ideal, increasing emphasis is put upon the active and virile virtues. Miss Darrah found that honesty, bravery, patriotism, leadership and intellectual ability are more esteemed as the children get older; that plain "goodness" is named by about the same proportion at every age; and that wealth, marvelous powers, and "He was good to me," motives which loom large in the answers of the younger children, tend to disappear among the older.

These studies encourage us in the belief that moral

[1] *Pedagogical Seminary*, Vol. 10, pages 101-143 (March, 1903).

ideals can be effectively presented to children through history and literature, story and biography. Not that these can be a substitute for their more concrete presentation in life itself. Example, personal influence, the suggestion of social environment, are of primary importance; yet, even when due allowance is made for the fact that these compositions were written in the atmosphere of the schoolroom and for the eye of the teacher, one gets from them an impression of the great moral value of biography and history. One sees, too, the wisdom of the present practice of our best schools in helping the children to study current events and to understand contemporary issues.

It is a mistake to think of the boy's hero worship as limited to the life of the "gang" or directed only toward its leader. True, he is most likely at this age to idealize physical strength or skill or daring, and to find his hero in football captain, star pitcher or successful hunter. But as fast as he comes to understand other types of achievement and to realize their worth, he is quite as ready to idealize and to worship heroes of another sort.

We shall not win him to new heroes by disparaging the old. If the old were clean, we want him to keep them and just to add the new. No man ought ever to lose his boyish admiration for physical skill or his respect for a good sportsman. Even if the old heroes were not desirable, it is the part of wisdom not to say too much about them, but to seek to replace them by others more attractive, then to trust to "the expulsive power of a new affection."

We shall not win the boy to new heroes by labeling them as such. I am inclined to think that we use the word too much in dealing with children and youth whom we believe to be in the hero-worshiping age. Heroes are not made to order; nor do they come put up in packages. Instinctively, a boy is put upon the defensive when you come to him with a hero, duly labeled, approved and stamped. The more indirect method is better. Tell the story of achievement concretely, interestingly, with fire and life; do not be afraid to put all the feeling into it that naturally and honestly comes to the surface in yourself; but let the boy do his own thinking. When Jesus was asked, "Who is my neighbor?" he did not ask the lawyer to study out of a book entitled "Neighbors of the Kingdom"; neither did he begin his story with, "Listen now, and I'll tell you about a good neighbor." He began, without prejudgment, to tell the story; and he ended it by asking the lawyer to draw his own conclusion.

FOR INVESTIGATION AND DISCUSSION

1. Differences between the hero-worship of childhood and youth, and that of adult life.
2. Test the ideals of a group of children in the way suggested by the studies of Miss Darrah and Professor Chambers.
3. Discuss and explain if you can, the changes in children's ideals shown by these studies.
4. The effectiveness of moral education through the study of history, biography, literature and current events.
5. Can you remember the hero-worship of your own

childhood and youth? Can you remember how the worship of some hero raised your ideals? Or how you were prejudiced from the start against a person who was too much labeled?

FOR FURTHER READING

Besides the articles by Miss Darrah and Professor Chambers, cited in the text, read the admirable discussion of the whole problem in F. C. SHARP: "Education for Character," especially Part III.

CHAPTER VI

WHEN A BOY WANTS TO GO TO WORK

WHEN does a boy want to go to work? It depends on the boy, of course; but we shall not be far wrong if we answer, When he is fourteen. External circumstances, as well as his own inward condition, make it easy and natural for him about that time to decide to quit school and to begin earning money.

At fourteen, a boy is usually no longer compelled by law to attend school, and the child labor laws no longer prohibit his employment, except in dangerous occupations. If he entered school at six, moreover, and has advanced normally, he is at fourteen completing the work of the elementary school, and faces the question whether or not to enter high school. In all too many cases he is likely to find his parents somewhat indifferent to the advantages of further schooling, and they may even manifest a more or less definite expectation that he will now assume a share of the family's support.

Inwardly, the boy feels himself to be coming into manhood. His sex powers are maturing. He is growing rapidly. He is putting away the things of childhood and is awakening to the grown-up world and reaching out toward its values. Yet he is not

quite sure of himself. Physically, he is awkward—"growing too fast," we say; mentally, he is full of yeasty aspirations and uncoördinated desires. He wants to assert himself; but just what the self is that he would assert, he has not yet been able to determine.

Studies of school attendance in the cities of the United States show, in general, that children are most likely to drop out of school between the ages of thirteen and sixteen. The greatest losses in enrolment are in the seventh and eighth grades and in the first two years of the high school. Ayres concluded, from an investigation undertaken by the Russell Sage Foundation in 1908-9, that the general tendency of city school systems in the United States is to carry all the children through the fifth grade, half of them to the final elementary grade, and one in ten to the final year of the high school. A better situation was revealed by the Cleveland Survey of 1915. In 1913, Ohio had passed a new compulsory education law, requiring boys to attend school until they are fifteen years of age and girls until they are sixteen. The survey of the Cleveland schools showed that practically all the children of that city remain in school until the age of twelve; at the age of fourteen, one-sixth have dropped out; at fifteen, nearly half have gone; at sixteen, two-thirds; and at seventeen, only twenty-one per cent remain. Stated in terms of the grades, it appeared that almost all the children complete the fifth grade, but one-fifth drop out by the time the seventh grade is reached, and over one-third quit before the eighth grade. Forty-one per cent of

all enter the high school, however, and nearly half of these finish the course—a showing far more creditable than in many cities.

In 1910, the United States Bureau of Labor published a study of the conditions under which children leave school to go to work. For special inquiry, 620 children were chosen, in seven representative localities. Of these, only thirty per cent were compelled to leave school because their earnings were necessarily to family support or their actual help was needed. Twenty-eight per cent quit school because their help or earnings were desired, though not necessary; and twenty-seven per cent because, for one reason or another, they were dissatisfied with school. Only ten per cent gave as reason their desire to go to work, or their preference of work to school.

This study is significant. We may yet further simplify its classification. There are three fundamental types of reason for a boy's leaving school: because he really wants to go to work, because he does not want to go to school, or because his parents want him to go to work. Of these reasons, the first alone is responsible for comparatively few cases. True, the boy is bound to feel budding vocational ambitions in the early teens and to want money of his own; but these inward stirrings are not in most cases enough to cause him to take the step unless they be reënforced by the external situation. If, however, he finds that his parents do not care much whether or not he goes further in school, or that they expect him to get to work or actually need

his earnings, the decision is likely to be made quickly. Or if there is something wrong with the school or with his adjustment to it—teachers incompetent or uninspiring, studies not practical enough, a school spirit lacking, or the boy himself not promoted—he is ready to quit if he gets a chance.

Retardation in school is undoubtedly one of the chief reasons why pupils drop out. The boy who fails to be promoted and gets behind grade becomes discouraged and feels humiliated to be grouped with younger children; and he is glad, as soon as the law permits him, to get into work where he can associate with others of his own age and receive weekly evidence of at least some measure of success in the form of a pay envelope.

The situation in this respect is more serious than we are likely to think. At the close of the school year 1912-13, the Russell Sage Foundation made a census of the thirteen-year-old boys in seventy-eight cities of the United States,—the boys, that is, who were approaching the end of the compulsory attendance period. It brought out the fact that there were some thirteen-year-old boys in every school grade from the kindergarten to the senior year of the high school. Over twenty-two thousand boys of this age were listed. Five per cent of these were still in the third grade or lower, thirty-two per cent in the fifth grade or lower, and fifty-seven per cent in the sixth grade or lower. One wishes that these retarded boys had been looked up again a year later, to discover how many of them had kept on at school, when no longer compelled by law to attend.

The worst of it is that the boy of fourteen who goes to work is likely to get the wrong kind of job. This is partly because of the hit-or-miss way in which most boys of this age get placed in jobs; but it is chiefly because most of the jobs open to them are of the "blind alley" type. These jobs lead nowhere. They do not develop skill or resource, they will never pay much more than the initial wage; and in the course of a few years the boy will find himself too old for that type of work, but without qualifications for a good job. He will become a "job hobo" or an unskilled laborer, one from time to time of the army of the unemployed.

Of 560 jobs held by boys and girls between fourteen and seventeen years of age, investigated by the University of Chicago Settlement, only thirty-five were of the sort that would lead to promotion or promised skill in some recognized trade. The Royal Commission on the Poor-Laws and Relief of Distress, in its report published in 1909, expresses the conviction that this aspect of boy labor in England is perhaps the most serious of the bodies of fact which they encountered in their exhaustive study of unemployment. "The mass of unemployment is continually being recruited by a stream of young men from industries which rely upon unskilled boy labor, and turn it adrift at manhood without any general or special industrial qualification. . . . It will never be diminished till this stream is arrested."

What are we going to do about it? No one yet knows the full answer to that question. Our realization of the problem is too recent; our efforts to solve

it are still in the stage of experiment. But it seems clear that the solution lies along four main lines of effort:

(1) *More efficient schools* can greatly lessen the amount of retardation. The worst of the systems studied had but twelve per cent of its thirteen-year-old boys where they ought to be, in the seventh grade or higher; the best had seventy-seven per cent there.

(2) *Vocational education* can be provided for boys and girls between fourteen and sixteen. They are not profitable workers; they ought still to be learners. But they can be learning trades and fitting themselves to work with some degree of intelligence and skill. The old apprenticeship system has practically passed; the state must provide a system of vocational education in its place.

(3) *Vocational guidance* can help the boy to choose his occupation wisely, in view both of his own abilities and of conditions and opportunities within the occupation. Systems of vocational guidance that are especially worthy of study are those of Birmingham, England; Edinburgh, Scotland; and Boston, Mass.

(4) *Follow-up protection* can be given to the young workers for the first two or three years of their employment. The public school should not cease to be interested in its pupils when the first work-certificate is granted. It could aid them greatly by a system of registration and follow-up service which would not leave them at the mercy of chance

employers, "Help Wanted" advertisements, or commercial labor bureaus.

FOR INVESTIGATION AND DISCUSSION

1. Find out the facts concerning the elimination of children from school in your own community.
2. Among the cases that you know of children leaving school before the end of the high school course, what were the causes of their decision?
3. What are the facts regarding the retardation of pupils in the schools of your community? How are your schools seeking to solve the problem of retardation?
4. How is your community handling the problems occasioned by the employment of young people in the 'teens? Does your community have an adequate system of vocational education? Of vocational guidance?
5. What is the possible function of the church with respect to the vocational guidance of young people?

FOR FURTHER READING

MEYER BLOOMFIELD: "Youth, School and Vocation," and the collection of papers made by the same author under the title: "Readings in Vocational Guidance." J. B. DAVIS: "Vocational and Moral Guidance" is suggestive. The facts concerning retardation are to be found in L. P. AYRES: "Laggards in Our Schools." The general volume by Ayres entitled "The Cleveland School Survey" summarizes the results of this significant educational survey; and more detailed information is found in the special volumes of the same series entitled "Wage Earning and Education" and "Child Accounting in the Public Schools."

CHAPTER VII

THE BREAKING OF OLD TIES

ALL right, I'll go. I didn't know the college really meant it." The speaker was a student who had been summoned before the dean for persistent failure to abide by the college rule requiring attendance at church on Sunday morning. The customary notices and warnings had not moved him; even a previous friendly talk with the dean had done no good. But now he acquiesced, gracefully enough, in the ultimatum that henceforth one unexcused absence from church would sever his relations with the college, and that excuses would be granted to him only in advance of a proposed absence.

He started for the door, then turned with a frank smile. "Do you know, dean, it will be hard for the folks at home to believe that I have gotten into trouble like this down here. It may sound funny to you, but at home I go to church every Sunday, morning and evening, and I teach a Sunday-school class." "That doesn't sound funny, but good," answered the dean. "But why then should you find it so hard to go to church here?" "Oh, it won't be hard. I guess the whole trouble is that I just didn't get started going regularly here."

He had diagnosed his case correctly. He was a

clean, wholesome, upright boy, neither irreligious nor a rebel against authority. The plain fact was that he simply had not gotten started going to church in the college town. He was drifting. One of his established habits of life had been interrupted by leaving home and he had not set up a like habit in its place. An old tie broken, he had formed no new one. He was not unlike some older folk whose church-going habit does not survive moving from town to town or even from one neighborhood to another in the same city.

The late teens and early twenties might be termed life's moving time. A great army of young people leave home every year, some to attend school or college, more to go to work. They pass out from the familiar environment of childhood into new and strange surroundings. They are no longer encompassed by parental authority. They must choose for themselves what to do and what to enjoy. Will they transfer to the new situation the habits, principles and ideals that they had gained in the old? Will they find new ties of moral relation to replace the old ties that circumstance has sundered? Or will the next few be years of wandering, even into a "far country"? Will there be waste and wild oats before the youth comes to himself? Will he pay the price of bitter experience to learn again the old truths that parents had tried to teach him in childhood?

The break is sharpest, and the danger greatest, in the case of the youth who goes to the city, to make his living among strangers. He faces a host of new temptations. He need not turn aside to seek them;

they offer themselves to him, pushed forward by the ever-present commercial exploiters of the people's play. Low theaters and picture shows that lie about life, saloons, cabarets and social clubs, public dance halls, billiard and pool rooms, bowling alleys, amusement parks, "white cities," excursion steamers, hotels without scruple and brothels unashamed, offer themselves without stint to any one who has the price.

Many an honest youth, seeking clean amusement, finds himself in the presence of what he would never have chosen had he known. It is what the public want, the promoters say; people like something with a little spice. All too soon, the youth may like his fun spiced too; he comes to feel that this is life. He is sophisticated. He knows the world. "You see, father and mother are awfully innocent. They don't know anything about the world as I have seen it," was the almost patronizing reason of a repentant youth for urging that his sin be kept from the knowledge of his parents.

The college student faces these same temptations, of course, especially if his college be in a large city. But he is in a measure protected. Some colleges are more, some less, paternal in their theory and practice, but all seek definitely to guide and foster the moral as well as the intellectual growth of their students. New knowledge and new interests, moreover, save the student from emptiness of mind and from the evil which so easily besets a soul unoccupied and idle. He makes friends, too. Sometimes they are of the wrong sort, but the dominant trend of college friendships, and of their more formal and re-

sponsible organization into fraternities, is wholesome. Athletic life, with its systematic exercise, its regular habits, its cleanliness and its ideals of team-play and good sportsmanship, is a mighty power for good—in a college that chooses so to conduct it. In short, the youth who leaves home to go to college finds there friendship, guidance and inspiration.

The youth who goes to the city to work, however, too often fails to find these. There is no place on earth quite so lonely as a strange city, especially if one is looking for a job. Every one else seems to belong there; every one else has business and friends; but I,—you feel—I am an outsider. You envy even the newsboy who sells you the evening paper, for his easy nonchalance, his air of being at home and among familiars. Even after the job has been secured, and what looks like the path to success has been entered upon, it is friends that you most need and most lack. Your fellow workers scatter to the four winds when the whistle blows to quit; and your most obvious bond of sympathy with others of the motley group at the boarding-house table is a common impecunity.

To be in the presence of new and strange temptations and without real friends is a precarious situation. "Guess I'll just see what it is like," wavers the will. "Nobody knows me," is an easy justification for things that one would never do under observation of those for whose good opinion he cares.

What can we do to help the youth in this transition time? First of all, we can prepare him for it. That means not simply that we shall use every re-

source of home and school and church to train him in right habits, to equip him with true ideas and to inspire him with high ideals. It means as well that from his earliest childhood we shall do all that we can to develop self-reliance within him. We shall educate him for initiative and responsibility.

Many well-meaning parents have failed here. They have maintained strict discipline and tempered it with love, but they have never left to the child an area, however small, within which he might decide and do things for himself. So he has been kept a child until he leaves home for college or work, and he is not prepared for freedom. The truer way is to lead the growing child into ever greater ranges of responsible choice; that the passage from home to the world beyond, from economic dependence to self-support and independence, may involve no leap or sudden break, but constitute rather a further step in a development long since begun. To take an obvious example, it is futile to expect a youth to know the worth of money and how to handle it, if he has never had a regular allowance of his own, with freedom in spending it, yet with intelligent guidance and with responsibility for meeting out of it a definite range of his own needs.

We can do much, again, to better the conditions which the youth is to face when he goes to the city. Its temptations are not ineradicable, however entrenched in privilege. Working conditions need not be unfair, or wholesome amusement lacking. The whole program of civic and social betterment has direct bearing here. It is for the sake of our chil-

dren. National prohibition of the liquor traffic may not cure old soaks or habitual tipplers, but the youth of to-morrow will not have that devil to fight.

Finally, we can make friends with the youth and open to him a desirable social life. We can offer him new ties for those that had to be broken. *The Friendly Church,* reads a great electric sign in one of our cities. Every church ought to be that, whether it must say so or not. If we fill the youth's life with good things,—wholesome recreations, happy associations, interests worth while—we need have little fear that he will yield to the worse; if we do not, where shall he go?

FOR INVESTIGATION AND DISCUSSION

1. Cite examples from your own experience of a breaking of old ties which resulted in the formation of bad habits or in the loss of good ones?
2. Why is the temptation greater for a boy working in a strange city than for a boy at college?
3. The problems raised by the commercialization of amusements.
4. Methods of developing self-reliance throughout growing childhood and youth.
5. In what ways can the church help to give to young people needed recreation and a desirable social life?

FOR FURTHER READING

Jane Addams: "The Spirit of Youth and the City Streets" and "A New Conscience and an Ancient Evil"; Louise de K. Bowen: "Safeguards for City Youth at Work and at

Play." The problem of educating children for self-reliance is admirably treated by MRS. DOROTHY CANFIELD FISHER in "Mothers and Children" and "Self-Reliance." The relation of the church to the social life of young people is dealt with in H. A. ATKINSON: "The Church and the People's Play" and H. W. GATES: "Recreation and the Church."

CHAPTER VIII

WHEN DOUBTS COME

IN his ballad of "Tomlinson," Rudyard Kipling has pictured unforgettably the correct conventional weakling, whose virtues and vices alike are but the reflection of those about him. Tomlinson lived in Berkeley Square, and, as is the custom of men, died and presented himself at heaven's gate. In answer to Peter's challenge, he spoke of his good in life:

"'O this I have read in a book,' he said, 'and that was told to me,
And this I have thought that another man thought of a prince in Muscovy.'
The good souls flocked like homing doves and bade him clear the path,
And Peter twirled the jangling keys in weariness and wrath.
'Ye have read, ye have heard, ye have thought,' he said, 'and the tale is yet to run:
By the worth of the body that once ye had, give answer—what ha' ye done?'

"'O this I have felt, and this I have guessed, and this I have heard men say,
And this they wrote that another man wrote of a carl in Norroway!'
'Ye have read, ye have felt, ye have guessed, good lack! Ye have hampered heaven's gate;
There's little room between the stars in idleness to prate!

O none may reach by hired speech of neighbor, priest, and kin
Through borrowed deed to God's good meed that lies so fair within;
Get hence, get hence to the Lord of Wrong, for doom has yet to run,
And . . . the faith that ye share with Berkeley Square uphold you, Tomlinson!' "

But when Tomlinson seeks admission at the mouth of hell, the devil rejects him too, for the imps who sift his worth report that "he has no soul of his own."

We all begin life upon a borrowed basis. Our moral and religious ideas are at first matters of hearsay. As children, we believe in God and in right because father and mother, teacher or friend, have told us so. But we do not remain children all our days. At some time or other, it is one's privilege and duty to pass from dependence to independence and self-reliance, from childhood to manhood, from beliefs borrowed at hearsay to convictions that are grounded in personal insight and choice.

Most of us make this change in the late teens or early twenties. It is not wrought in a night. We pass more or less gradually from the borrowed to the personal basis. Individuals differ greatly, however. Some make the transition early, others later; some rapidly, others more slowly; some with even pace in all-round harmonious development, others oddly lagging in some aspects of character or belief while precocious in other respects.

In some the transition involves no doubts. Experience confirms for them the precepts of childhood,

and establishes the truth of their fathers' faith. Their new insights compel no contradiction of old principles, no break with early teaching. Their intellectual and moral development is continuous and straightforward. This happens more often, perhaps, than we think. The gaining of personal convictions no more necessarily involves a wandering for a time in doubt than does the gaining of character involve a sojourn in the far country of sin. Doubting Castle is no more inevitable than the Slough of Despond.

Yet to doubt is easy and natural at this time of life. Doubt comes because of youth's very vitality and earnestness, coupled with its intellectual self-confidence. Reason and will are maturing, and the young man is facing real and practical problems as he begins life for himself. He is eager to be doing, impatient with doddering ways, idealistic, sure of himself and sure of reason. No problem but has its one, and one only solution, he believes; and I need but think the thing through to find it. There is no issue upon which men cannot come to agreement, he holds, if they will only be reasonable enough. He is, in short, credulous of reason. His world must be logical; if not, so much the worse for the world. He has not yet been baffled by unreason as older men have been; he has not sensed, as they have, the complexity of most of life's motives and situations. His thinking and speech are full of disjunctions; his favorite argument is the dilemma. Things are *either* this *or* that for him; he is not likely to realize that

they may be a little of *both* this *and* that with an admixture of several *elses* as well.

Little wonder, therefore, that the young man of the early twenties is a creed-maker of definitely pragmatic temper, and inclined to question many of the old dogmas. He is but bringing to religion the same confident powers of mind with which he approaches everything else.

His mind is filled, moreover, with new ideas. At no time of life, perhaps, does so much new knowledge pour in upon one as in these years of high school, college, and first vocational experience. William James once said that most men gain practically all the ideas they will ever have, outside of their own business, before they are twenty-five. Yes, and they gain most of these after they are eighteen. From eighteen to twenty-five is life's intellectual expansion-time.

The youth's religion should expand with the rest of his mental outfit. But often this does not take place at once. The new ideas gained in other fields operate to the discredit of his older religious conceptions, but do not replace them with others more adequate. In the name of geology he questions Genesis, and in the name of biology is moved to deny, not simply the doctrine of special creation, but the whole idea of divine purpose and providence. Physics starts him upon a mechanical conception of the universe, and introduces him to the ether which Haeckel thought would make a better god than the One whom Christians worship. He studies a psychology which has long since lost the soul, and which

is in danger, in these latter days, of forgetting that there is such a thing as mind. Philosophy, to which he turns for help on ultimate problems, only mixes him up. He gets an inkling of modern views of the Bible, and decides that nobody can know what parts of it to believe.

Difficulties of this sort are not limited to students in high school and college. The youth who left school to go to work gets new ideas too—from the popular science of the magazines and Sunday supplements, from the "uplift" editorials in yellow newspapers, from soap-box orators and labor agitators; and the result is likely to be more disastrous because the ideas are poorer on the one hand and his mind less trained on the other.

Even that student who has rightly grasped the sciences, has understood his philosophy courses, and has been led by them and by his study of Biblical literature to adequate and true religious conceptions,—the student whose religious ideas are keeping pace with the rest of his moral and intellectual development,—is likely to doubt the teaching of his elders. His new ideas will not own the old. His mind dwells upon the difference between what he now believes and what was taught him in childhood. In many cases, of course, this difference is real; he *was* wrongly taught, for not all parents and teachers know the truth or how to teach it to children. But even if he was rightly taught, he was able to get but a child's understanding of the matter. And it is this child's understanding of it that he now doubts. The difference that he feels so keenly is probably not, as

he thinks it is, a difference between the old and the new generations; it is rather the difference between the child that was and the man that has come to be. His doubt is the measure, not of the world's advance, but of his own development.

How shall we deal with the doubts of later adolescence? *First,* by recognizing their naturalness. Doubt in these years is no sin; neither is it evidence of some moral perversity. It is incidental to the transition from borrowed beliefs to personal convictions.

Second, by knowing enough to meet and answer them, and to guide young people to the truth they seek. Natural as it is, doubt is no mere disease which everybody is sure to have some time and which one cannot do much for except to wait until the patient gets over it,—somewhat as people used to regard mumps and measles. Neither is it to be repressed and stifled. Better far to give it opportunity to realize and express itself, then meet it with knowledge—open-minded, reasonable, adequate, true. That above all else is what the doubting youth wants and needs—not so much sympathy or authority, or even leadership, as knowledge.

Third, by ourselves realizing and helping young people to understand the place that the will has in determining our most fundamental convictions. These are seldom matters of coercive knowledge; they are the fruit of action and of faith as well as of intellect. Every teacher of young people in the doubting years should be familiar with William James' great essay on "The Will to Believe."

Fourth, by remembering and helping young people to see that eccentricity is in itself no virtue. Individuality is precious, and personal convictions are worth the travail they cost. But individuality can be fully realized only in social relation; and one may base upon grounds that are personal, convictions that are the common heritage of the race. Youth, not fully understanding this, is sometimes tempted to mistake individualistic self-will for individuality, eccentricity for independence. Edward Rowland Sill put the truth of the matter in verses that should be better known:

"Doubting Thomas and loving John
Behind the others walking on:—

" 'Tell me now, John, dare you be
One of the minority?
To be lonely in your thought,
Never visited or sought,
Shunned with secret shrug, to go
Through the world esteemed its foe:
To be singled out and hissed,
Pointed at as one unblessed,
Warned against in whispers faint
Lest the children catch a taint:
To bear off your titles well—
Heretic and infidel?
If you dare, come now with me,
Fearless, confident, and free.'

" 'Thomas, do you dare to be
Of the great majority?
To be only, as the rest,
With heaven's common comforts blessed:
To accept, in humble part,
Truth that shines in every heart:
Never to be set on high

Where the envious curses fly:
Never name or fame to find,
Still outstripped in soul and mind,
To be hid, unless to God,
As one grass-blade in the sod
Underfoot with millions trod?
If you dare, come with us, be
Lost in love's great unity.' "

FOR INVESTIGATION AND DISCUSSION

1. Why is doubt easy and natural in the late teens and early twenties? Is it necessary or inevitable?

2. Do you remember what particular doubts bothered you at this period, when you were making the transition from borrowed to personal convictions?

3. What should be the attitude of older folk to the doubts of later adolescence?

4. What do you mean by faith? Is faith a necessary factor in determining one's moral and religious convictions? Give reasons for your answer.

5. What is the rightful meaning and place of authority in the moral and religious life?

6. In how far does the individual have the right to believe as conscience dictates? Is it possible to base upon individual grounds convictions that are the common heritage of the race?

FOR FURTHER READING

R. S. BOURNE: "Youth and Life" presents the standpoint of youth. G. A. COE: "The Spiritual Life" gives an account of the religious doubts of young people. WILLIAM JAMES' essay on "The Will to Believe" should be read by every teacher. Its point of view is applied specifically to Christian convictions in E. H. ROWLAND: "The Right to

Believe." Books that young people will find most stimulating and helpful are those by HARRY E. FOSDICK: "The Meaning of Faith," "The Meaning of Prayer," "The Manhood of the Master," and "The Assurance of Immortality."

CHAPTER IX

THE FORMING OF HABITS

READERS of Joseph Lincoln's "Extricating Obadiah" will remember Captain Noah Newcomb's dramatic entrance, humped over the steering wheel of a "tinny" runabout, his elbows well out and his hat jammed on the back of his head, his eyes glued upon the macadam directly in front of the radiator, but the car shooting from side to side of the road, its horn squawking continually, till it crashed through a rickety fence and fetched up hub-deep in a little pond. "I've hit most everywhere since I left Provincetown in this dratted thing," observed the captain, "but I ain't hit the middle of the road yet."

Six months later Captain Newcomb and his car appeared again on Trumet's main street. "But now," reports the chronicler, "he did not crouch over the wheel, his hands bent in a petrified clutch at its circumference and his eyes glaring at the road just ahead. Indeed, no. The captain leaned back against the upholstery, and his clutch upon the wheel was light, but confident. He did not glare at the road; he smoked a cigar and looked easily about him. And in the wake left in the dust by the tires of that little car there was not to be discerned one

nervous jiggle. It was plain that Captain Noah had become, as he had sworn to become, 'boss of the ship.' "

What made the difference? *Practice,* of course. That is the only way to become a skilled automobile driver. One may take lesson after lesson on how to handle a car and may thoroughly understand the principles involved; but he will not drive well until he has had a certain amount of experience and practice upon the road. Some movements must be made matters of habit—the coördination of eye and hand involved in steering, the control of clutch and brake and accelerator, deftness in shifting gears and readiness to use the emergency brake. The beginner has to think of all these things and of how to do them; the practiced driver does them as a matter of course. They have become second nature. He does them as naturally and as easily as he walks or talks or writes; and his mind concerns itself, not with the mechanical details of the action, but with its objective ends. Just as, after one has learned to write, he thinks no longer of how to form the letters, but of what he wants to say, the practiced driver, no longer compelled to think of just what to do to control his car and how to do it, is free to think of where he is going and to take account of every obstacle or possible danger.

This principle of practice is universal. It applies to the whole of life. We are naturally plastic. We are so built that every experience leaves its trace upon mind and body. An action done once is easier to do a second time; done twice, is still easier to do

a third time. Any two things that happen together or are in any way connected in our minds, tend in future to recall one another. Any order of events, once followed, suggests itself thereafter as a natural order, to be followed again. Any succession of ideas, once traversed in mind, is apt to repeat itself.

These are examples of the working of the law of habit. It is the most universal and fundamental of all the laws of mental life. Without it we could never *learn* anything or *acquire* any skill. We should remain raw animals, creatures of mechanical instinct or random impulse. The baby that learns to recognize its mother's face and to prattle "ma-ma," does so because of this elemental tendency of things that have been put together in experience to stay put together and to recall one another. The child that learns to write or figure or speak a piece, the girl who learns to sew or knit, the boy who learns to throw a baseball or to shoot, the woman who falls in love, the man who makes a decision upon which may hang the happiness of many people—all are able to do what they do because of this law. All that we ever come to be because of what we learn or acquire in the course of experience, as distinguished from what we are by inborn nature, we owe in part, and at bottom, to habit. It makes possible all growth and development in mind and character.

Yet habit does not insure growth and development, or guarantee their right direction. It simply keeps conserving all that we think and do, storing it up and making it a part of ourselves, and rendering it available for future use. If we are content

day after day to do no more than repeat a given round, whether of drudgery or of idle indulgence, habit accustoms us to that lot and development practically ceases. If we think and do wrong things, habit helps us to develop in that direction almost as readily as in the right direction.

The truth is that we are *practicing something* all the time. The law of habit is always at work. It does not select only those thoughts and actions that we could wish it to conserve; it takes account of all that we do or think or say. It is possible through carelessness to fall into bad habits, even though we want good ones.

I am changing my game. I have played tennis all my life, but now am taking up golf. I have been acting in accordance with the principle of which we have been thinking. The way to learn golf, I have said to myself, is to play golf; here, as everywhere, "practice makes perfect." But I have found that that is not the whole truth. The other day I met an old gentleman nearly twice my age who posted a score of 89, while mine was 113; and he gave me some advice. "Be sure," he said, "to take a few lessons from the professional. It will give you a right start, and good habits are just as hard to break as bad ones. Then every few months take a couple of lessons more, so that he may discover the bad habits into which you will fall from time to time, and help you to get rid of them."

That is sound advice. Mere practice is not enough, if one is to form right habits in golf or in anything else. It should be intelligent practice, that begins

with clear ideas, gets a good start, and seeks correction from time to time. Good habits so begotten are, indeed, "just as hard to break as bad ones."

In his excellent book on "Habit Formation and the Science of Teaching" Principal Rowe formulates the following four steps in any lesson which aims at the development of a habit: (1) *to help the pupil develop the idea of the habit*—that is, to get him to know definitely and clearly just what he is to commit or acquire; (2) *to work up his initiative* or zest for the task, to give him a motive for acquiring that habit; (3) *to secure abundant and genuine practice* through attentive, painstaking repetition; (4) *to guard against exceptions, lapses, and modifications.*

William James's classic chapter on "Habit" gives four practical rules of habit formation: (1) *Launch yourself with as strong and decided an initiative as possible.* Get a good, clear start, in other words; and "envelop your resolution with every aid you know." (2) *Never suffer an exception to occur till the new habit is securely rooted in your life.* "Each lapse," he says, "is like the letting fall of a ball of string which one is carefully winding up; a single slip undoes more than a great many turns will wind again." (3) *Seize the very first opportunity to act on every resolution you make, and on every emotional prompting you may experience in the direction of the habits you aspire to gain.* Otherwise, you are falling into the habit of failing to act. (4) *Keep the faculty of effort alive in you by a little gratuitous exercise every day.* Do things, that is, that you would rather not do, for the sake of maintaining

habits of concentration, energetic volition, self-control, and self-denial.

Professor Bain, whom James followed in this matter, long ago summed up the whole philosophy of habit formation in two conditions: "Adequate initiative and an unbroken persistence."

FOR INVESTIGATION AND DISCUSSION

1. Formulate the law of habit.
2. Distinguish as aspects of the law of habit between what has been termed the law of exercise and the law of effect. Show the importance of each in the learning process.
3. What do you understand by the association of ideas? Show how this is an application of the law of habit.
4. What are the steps in acquiring a new habit or breaking an old one?
5. The effect of lapses and exceptions.
6. The effect of failure to act out good resolutions or high emotions.

FOR FURTHER READING

Read the discussions of habit in JAMES' "Psychology," COLVIN and BAGLEY'S "Human Behavior," and in THORNDIKE'S "Elements of Psychology," "Principles of Teaching," and "Education." For the pedagogical applications of the law of habit read S. H. ROWE: "Habit-Formation and the Science of Teaching"; for its moral applications read JOHN MACCUNN: "The Making of Character" and E. E. R. MUMFORD: "The Dawn of Character."

CHAPTER X

THE DEVELOPMENT OF THE WILL

A FAVORITE resort of my children is the little zoölogical garden of our city—East Rock Farm, they call it The other day we had an exciting experience there. A gorgeous blue peacock attacked our automobile while parked, and scratched it with his spurs, damaging himself a good deal, of course, in the process.

"Pore ole Bill," the keeper observed. "I don't know what we kin do with 'im. He never will learn no sense. He just can't stand it to have another peacock around. And soon as he sees hisself in the sides of an automobile, he jumps at it. He's hurt hisself lots of times, but he never seems to learn nothing."

Poor old Bill, indeed! I could not help thinking of him on the way home and pitying him. With all his beauty of tail, he has a very small head. And, in this matter at least, he is the creature of imperious instinct. He is so made that he cannot brook the presence of another of his kind without challenge to battle; and as soon as he sees the reflection of his own body in the polished sides of an automobile, the battle is on. He does not think. He makes no choice. He cannot control himself. Instinct pushes

him on. To see another peacock means fight for him, and he does not stop to inquire whether the opposing peacock be real or not. The keeper was right: "He never will learn no sense."

We human animals are like Bill in that we have instincts; but we are unlike him—or should be—in that we can learn sense. Our instincts are modifiable by habit and experience. Each time that they are used, they become more definite and may become more intelligent. The idea of their result remains in memory and may guide future action.

Here, then, is the beginning of will: when action is guided by the *idea of a result.* Many of our actions are mere responses to present sense-stimuli, as dodging a blow, turning toward a sound, lifting the hat when we greet a woman friend, glancing over the evening paper, and the like. We do not consciously intend anything by such actions, as a rule; we do them because they are appropriate to the present circumstances. Other actions are determined by inward impulses, such as eating when hungry, drinking when thirsty, breaking into song when happy, and so on. Will begins when the action is determined by the idea of some result or consequence. We *intend* this result; and we perform the action in order to secure it.

Yet the presence of an intention is not enough to constitute an action one of will. Here is a man who runs off to play golf, seemingly, every time that the idea of the game enters his head, to the neglect of other things. Here is a woman whose tongue is constantly getting her into trouble, for she always

"speaks out her mind." Both are sorry afterward; they say, "I didn't think." And that is the actual fact: they did not think *enough.*

Their actions were idea-motived, we grant. The man played golf because he wanted to do it; the woman intended to say what she said. But the trouble was that neither stopped to think of anything else. There were no alternative ideas present, no other intentions brought to mind to offset these, no deliberation, no weighing of issues, no choice. They reacted almost as directly, immediately and unthinkingly to the presence of an idea in their minds as Bill reacts to the sight of another peacock.

Such actions, even though motived by an idea, are not properly acts of will. What above all else distinguishes willed action from habitual or impulsive action, is the presence of alternative ideas and intelligent choice between them.

It seems clear, as a matter of fact, that Nature intended us to be deliberative beings. We differ from Bill, and from all lower animals like him, not simply in that our instincts can be modified by experience, but in that we possess a far larger number of instincts—so many, indeed, that they conflict with one another. Bill's is a simple life. His repertoire of actions is pretty meager. Comparatively few of the aspects of the world count as circumstances to him, and for each of these he is equipped with a definite response. Consequently, Bill makes such mistakes as he did in attacking the automobile. "The whole story of our dealings with the lower wild animals," says William James, "is the history

of our taking advantage of the way in which they judge of everything by its mere label, as it were, so as to ensnare or kill them. Nature, in them, has left matters in this rough way, and made them act *always* in the manner which would be *oftenest* right. There are more worms unattached to hooks than impaled upon them; therefore, on the whole, says Nature to her fishy children, bite at *every* worm and take your chances."

But Nature is not so careless of her higher children. She wants them to be able to discriminate safety from danger, friend from enemy, right from wrong. And so she implants within the higher birds and mammals, and most of all within man, *many* rather than few instincts and impulses. We may respond to a given situation with sociability or shyness, curiosity or timidity, bashfulness or vanity, rivalry or coöperation, self-sacrifice or pugnacity, and so on. We are embarrassed, as the peacock is not, by the very number of impulses that well up within us and by the variety of possible actions which they suggest. And so we are driven to use our minds. Will arises, not because we have no instincts, but rather out of the fact that we have so many that they contradict and block one another. Just which is the right one to follow in any particular situation, we must learn to decide for ourselves in the light of experience. We thus run the risk of error, and we do, as a matter of fact, make many mistakes. But they are *our* mistakes; we make them ourselves. Nature does not make them for us, as she does in case of the fish and the peacock.

When we deliberate we hold in imagination what Professor Dewey has called a *dramatic rehearsal* of various possible lines of action. "We give way, *in our mind,* to some impulse; we try, *in our mind,* some plan. Following its career through various steps, we find ourselves in imagination in the presence of the consequences that would follow: and as we then like and approve, or dislike and disapprove, these consequences, we find the original impulse or plan good or bad." We do this with each suggested course of action in turn and weigh the respective consequences; then make our decision in light of this mental trying them out. My wife and children are to spend the summer months in Minnesota. They must go alone, and I shall join them later. How shall I send them? By steamer over the Great Lakes from Buffalo to Duluth or by rail via Chicago? If the latter, shall they go from New York over the New York Central or the Pennsylvania? One after another, we summon to mind the various possibilities; in imagination we traverse the several routes, recalling our experiences with each and prophesying as best we can what it is apt to be like this time. The steamer trip is one of the most pleasant in all America; but it is too long for a lone woman with the care of three children. Either the New York Central or the Pennsylvania will enable them to reach Minnesota, with only one night on the sleeping-car; that is why we consider no other roads. But the Pennsylvania tosses one more as it curves through the mountains, and there is the roar of freight trains passing at five-minute intervals all night. Still, the

Pennsylvania has a union station at Chicago with the Milwaukee road, which is to carry them to their destination; and if they take the New York Central they will be compelled to transfer there from one station to another. We shall choose the Pennsylvania.

What factors enter into the development of an efficient will? The foregoing discussion justifies the answer: Every factor that enters into the development of the mind itself, for will is simply a name for *mind in action.* More specifically, the development of the will depends primarily upon (1) the widening of knowledge through experience, acquiring adequate and usable ideas and power to conceive alternatives and predict consequences; (2) practice in deliberation, developing right habits of thinking and sound methods of reasoning; (3) the development of such ideals and the cultivation of such feelings as shall lead one to prefer and to choose wisely among the consequences presented to the mind in deliberation; (4) practice in prompt, energetic action in execution of one's decisions.

In the development of the will much depends upon one's *personal associations*—which is the same thing as to say that much depends upon the other wills with which it deals. The direction of one's will is often determined for life by early training in the home; and to the end of one's days the quality of his will depends in part upon his family, friends and business associates, the demands that they make on him and the environment which they constitute for him. Ever since St. Paul, moreover, Christians have

rightly believed that the ultimate secret of strength of will lies in one's personal association with God through Christ Jesus.

FOR INVESTIGATION AND DISCUSSION

1. Illustrate by further examples the difference between willed action and impulsive action.
2. What is the relation of the multiplicity and indefiniteness of human instincts to the development of the will?
3. Follow your own trend of thought in deliberating upon some problem of action, and state the dramatic rehearsal which goes on in your mind.
4. What are the four factors which enter into the development of an efficient will?
5. Think of some case of weakness of will and state to which of these factors you deem it attributable.
6. Why is the cultivation of right feelings important to the development of the will?
7. In what respects does the development of the will depend upon one's personal associations?

FOR FURTHER READING

The chapter on "Will" in JAMES' "Psychology"; MRS. E. E. R. MUMFORD's "The Dawn of Character"; and H. C. KING's "Rational Living." Those who care to push further into a study of the intellectual conditions of efficient willing, will find guidance in JOHN DEWEY's "How We Think" and I. E. MILLER's "The Psychology of Thinking."

CHAPTER XI

THE ROOTS OF LAW

THE word "law" has several meanings. We think first, perhaps, of *civil law*. Its basis is that of political authority. It is enacted by the recognized law-makers of a political group, such as a community, state or nation; and it is enforced by the police power of that group. It expresses what *must* be, if one would escape the penalties which are established as part of the law itself.

We think, again, of *natural law*. Its basis is that of fact. Such laws as the law of gravitation, the laws of thermo-dynamics, the laws of digestion, the law of habit, need not to be enacted. They simply *are*. God enacted them when he created the world. They express, not so much what must be, as what *is*. We cannot help but follow these laws. They are statements of what, under given circumstances, is sure to take place, because nature is built that way and is uniformly consistent.

Moral law expresses what men *ought* to do and be. It is enforced by an inward sense of obligation rather than by an external "must"; and it is unlike natural law in that we can refuse to follow it if we choose. It is concerned with ideals of living; it defines right and wrong.

Different as these kinds of law are, they are alike in one fundamental and most important respect: all tell us *how to act,* in one respect or another. A civil law, for example, forbids us to spit in public places under penalty of a fine; a natural law, once understood, bids us sleep with our bedroom windows open; a moral law tells us that it is right to speak the truth and wrong to lie. We live in a world of laws, and we learn how to live only as we learn how to obey and to use these laws. We derive from them what one might call *personal laws* or principles of action.

We begin to do this very early. As soon as a child can form a purpose of his own and has some idea of what to do in order to fulfill that purpose, this is evidence that he has begun to understand some of the laws of the world about him. His recognition of law is coincident with the development within him of intelligence and will.

A child gets his ideas of how to act from four main sources, which constitute the great roots of law in his life. These are habit, imitation, authority and social initiative.

1. *Habit and the association of ideas.* A child derives his principles of action, in the first place, from his own experiences and their results. "A burnt child dreads the fire," runs the trite old proverb. He has learned a natural law, and derived from it a principle of action.

The child is not always, or even often, conscious of the laws that he is making for himself. The principle of habit operates mechanically and unnoticed.

But it operates inevitably. Experiences that result happily tend naturally to be repeated; those that are painful will in future be avoided. Lines of action that have been successful will be followed again; those that have met defeat or brought unhappiness will be tried no more.

Sometimes, on the other hand, the process is not mechanical. More than mere habit, it involves an association of ideas. The child thinks about his experience, and as a result of his thinking makes a rule for himself.

I remember observing a two-year-old's first meeting with a dog. He went toward it without fear and with an evident desire to play, but scurried back crying, "Daddy, daddy, dogs *bark*. 'Care me." For several months he could not be induced to go near a dog. But one day the father introduced to him an especially quiet and good-humored dog with the remark that here was one who was friendly to little boys; and he greatly enjoyed petting it. "Friendly dogs are nice," he said. And ever since, he appeals to father or mother whenever he sees a dog. "Is that a friendly dog?" he queries. If the answer is Yes, he approaches the dog with all confidence; if No, he sticks close to parental protection.

It is not far from the truth to say that a child is continually reworking his experience. On the basis of what happens under given circumstances, he is making and remaking, consciously or unconsciously, rules of action for himself. His understanding of the facts and laws of the world about him is of course incomplete and may be much mistaken; the

little principles of action that he gains may fall far short of the truth. Yet his mind is at work and his will is acquiring strength and direction.

2. *Imitation and suggestion.* A child derives principles of action, again, from what he observes of the behavior and experiences of others. There has been debate among psychologists in late years concerning the mechanism of imitation. Professor Thorndike, particularly, has denied the existence of any special instinct that leads either children or animals to do whatever they see others do. He has so well established his position as to throw the burden of proof upon those who believe that there is such an instinct. But the objective fact of imitation, in the large, remains, whatever may be its mechanism. Adults, as well as children, tend to act like those about them.

The persons we meet and live with are the most live and real and interesting of experience's data. To adapt ourselves to them is one of the most immediate of life's problems, upon the solution of which our sense of well-being, our happiness or unhappiness, largely and directly depends. The presence of others is thus one of the most compelling of stimuli. People naturally attract our attention. Their experiences seem almost to be an extension of our own. Their behavior is among the most potent of suggestions.

If this be true of adults, it is even more true of children, who are dependent upon older folk and just beginning to acquire knowledge and self-control. Their little minds and bodies are exceedingly plastic.

They seem almost to absorb the world about them. They reflect their social environment. What their elders do is far more potent in shaping their lives than what these same elders say.

3. *Authority*. No wise parent or teacher will just let his children alone in the midst of natural forces and social experiences, to understand these as best they may. The risks are too great, and life too complex. It is his privilege to provide for and to protect his children so that they may have opportunity to grow, and so to simplify and interpret their environment that they may be helped to understand the great fundamental laws of nature and human life. He will therefore tell his children things that would cost too much were they to be left simply to the teaching of experience; he will command when commandment is needed; and to misdeeds he will annex punishments—even spankings sometimes—in order that the children may be helped to discriminate right from wrong.

As the child makes rules of action for himself, then, he must adapt himself not simply to the ways of nature and to the behavior of other persons, but to the laws of those who are set in authority over him. The important point is that the value of such adaptation to authority depends upon the character of the authority and its relation to the other roots of law. If the commands of the parents reflect the real laws of life, natural, moral and social; if they serve to exhibit and interpret those laws to the child upon the level of his needs and experiences; if the parents' own life is subject to these same laws—in

short, if the child finds the deliverances of authority to be consistently backed up by his own experiences and his observation of the experiences of others, so that habit and imitation lead him in the same direction,—then authority is rightly used, and is of the highest value. An authority, on the other hand, that is arbitrary, out of relation to the real principles of justice and right or inconsistent with the parents' own life, introduces confusion into the child's experience and is likely to beget rebellion. We older folk who thank God now that we had fathers and mothers whose stern discipline made us obey are not really thankful so much for the spankings that we received as for the fact that the spankings were administered for right reasons and backed up by true instruction and a consistent life.

4. *Social initiative.* A child's principles of action are not fully his own until they have passed from a merely adaptive to an initiative basis. The final motive of morality is not that simply of adaptation to external conditions, natural or social; it is rather the desire to enter helpfully and creatively into the common life of men. One becomes law-abiding then, not because he must but because he wants to do his share and make his contribution to the good of the group.

This motive, too, enters early into the life of a child. It manifests itself as soon as he can feel his helpfulness in a common task or play. Under the misleading of the recapitulation theory and its analogues we have been wont to underestimate its place in these early years. We have been told that child-

hood is non-social, non-moral, non-religious. There could be no greater mistake. While it is true that moral training in childhood must lay the larger emphasis relatively upon conditions external to the child himself, it is equally true that even very little children love to help and care for others. I have seen primary schoolrooms that were models of law-abiding discipline, not because of the teacher's external authority, but because of the inward initiative of a common devotion to some project in which all the children had a share.

We do not need so much to make rules of life for our children as to give them a fair opportunity to make the right sort of rules for themselves. That means that we shall seek in every way to render experience consistent with precept, and to make our measures of discipline express the real laws of life. Above all, we shall seek to coöperate in their little enterprises and to enlist their coöperation in ours, that the rules of life may come to be a joint product of our common experience, and that morality may be based for them upon grounds of inward initiative.

FOR INVESTIGATION AND DISCUSSION

1. Give examples of a child's making laws for himself as a result of habit and the association of ideas.

2. Do children possess a general instinct to imitate? If possible, look up Thorndike's views on this point. If there is no such general instinct, how are the objective facts of imitation to be explained?

3. The place of authority, precept and punishment in the moral development of children.

4. The importance of consistency of life with precept. What do you think of the parent who sends his children to Sunday school, but himself has nothing to do with it or with the church? Give reasons for your answer.

5. Social initiative in early and middle childhood, and the changes in this respect which take place in later childhood and early adolescence.

FOR FURTHER READING

The best treatments of the psychology of moral development in childhood are in the book by MRS. MUMFORD on "The Dawn of Character" and in Part III of G. A. COE'S "A Social Theory of Religious Education." Excellent books on moral education are J. MACCUNN: "The Making of Character"; SNEATH and HODGES: "Moral Training in the School and Home"; PATTERSON DUBOIS: "The Natural Way in Moral Training"; F. C. SHARP: "Education for Character." The last of these is an especially thorough study of the possibility of moral education in the public schools, which every teacher would do well to read. On the question of imitation look up THORNDIKE and MCDOUGALL in the works already cited.

CHAPTER XII

HOW RELIGION GROWS

HOW shall one describe the natural growth of religion in a human life? It seems almost an impossible task. For religion is more than a natural growth. It is a living, personal relation with God. It cannot be described in terms merely of "laws" and "periods of development." It depends upon God's own uncounted, resourceful ways, as in love and mercy He seeks to reach the minds and hearts and to enlist the wills of His children. And it depends upon their ways—ways sometimes reasonable but often ignorant, capricious and self-willed—to which He adapts His measures of redeeming grace. The growth in the soul of real religion—as distinguished from pious convention—is a matter supremely individual. One touches here upon the inmost secret of each separate life.

These very statements, however, imply that religion has a natural as well as a supernatural side. Growth in religion depends in part upon the growth of the human self as a whole. Even God must take His children as they are, if He is to help them become what they can be and ought to be. He must fit His help to their need, His teaching to their understanding. One's religion thus reflects what he is.

"When I was a child, I spake as a child, I understood as a child, I thought as a child: but when I became a man, I put away childish things."

In a general way, three stages may be distinguished through which most persons pass as they grow in religion. There is the stage, first, of nurture in religion and learning about religion; second, of getting religion as a conscious personal possession; third, of using and understanding religion in maturing Christian service and experience. Characterizing each by a single phrase, we may speak of the stages of Christian nurture, Christian decision or conversion, and Christian experience. The first stage corresponds in general to childhood; the second, to adolescence; the third, to mature life.

To little children, religion is a relatively objective affair. It constitutes an atmosphere in which they find themselves, an environment in which they are nurtured; it offers something to be learned about. They accept it, as they do everything else, as a matter of course. It does not present itself to them as a way of life that calls for personal decision. Children do not yet, as they will later, feel an inward need of God. This is for many reasons: because they are directly and completely dependent upon the parents, whose care seems to them to be all-sufficient; because their range of interests is small, their time-span short, and their life more of a moment-by-moment affair than it will be later; because they are not yet experiencing the full tug of sinful temptations; because they have not yet gained those ideals of reasonableness and of moral and spiritual unity of

life that will in due time beget the divine discontent of the adolescent years.

This is not to say, however, that the religious life of little children is unimportant. Quite the contrary, it is all-important that in childhood such an objective relation to religion be acquired and such growth in religion begun as shall insure intelligent and right decision when the great subjective issue presents itself. In his striking book on "The Cornerstone of Education," Dr. Edward Lyttelton, speaking from long experience as the head master of a famous English public school, records his conviction that the great moral and spiritual alternative is really decided for most boys in the course of their first eight years of life as children in the home of their parents. The conversions which take place in the teens or later, he believes, in so far as they are not directly miraculous interpositions of divine grace, are to be accounted for as the coming to full result and to clear consciousness of the influences of these early years.

How shall we help our children to acquire this right objective relation to religion? By true instruction, most obviously; by telling them about God and teaching them His ways as these have been revealed to us in Christ Jesus. A little child's innocent trustful credulity opens his mind to the truths of religion as to new ideas of every sort.

Children will understand what we tell them in terms of their own experiences, of course, and the result may often seem odd to our more sophisticated minds. "God is everybody's papa; He will spank us

if we are naughty," was one tiny youngster's way of putting the idea of the Fatherhood of God.

As fast, however, as they grow able to understand the connections of events and to mark off fact from fancy, they will begin to criticize their own notions in this as in other fields, to rework them, and to press on toward more adequate ideas. There are real metaphysical and theological issues involved in such a question as that of a boy of ten: "Mamma, God must have known that Adam and Eve would eat that apple, and they couldn't help doing it if He planned to have them do it. So why did He blame them?" It is the parent's privilege and duty to answer such questions frankly and directly, with the truth as he himself believes it. The unforgivable sin here is to lie to your children; and it is only a shade less culpable to put them off with the promise that when they are older you will explain these things to them.

But instruction, however true, is not enough. Children understand what we tell them, it has just been said, in terms of their own experiences. It is the parent's duty to afford to his children such experiences as may rightly serve as the apperceptive basis for their understanding of the great truths of religion. So only can he give body and content to the ideas which he seeks to impart in words.

The child's experiences of the world of nature about him may constitute such an apperceptive basis for religion. Fear, wonder, curiosity, reverence, dependence, faith, trust, the impulse to union and the desire to feel at home in the world—all these psychological motives to religion enter in an elemental way

into the life of the child as they have entered into the life of the race of which he is a member. The father and mother who give to their little ones a concrete acquaintance with and understanding of the great world in which they live, may readily interpret that world to them in religious terms, not as a substitute for, but in addition to, the scientific description of the same facts.

The child's social experiences are yet more fundamental and more direct in their bearing upon his understanding of religion. The home life of the family does more to determine the moral and religious character of the children than any amount of instruction. Horace Bushnell used a true figure of speech, when he said that no child is fully born when his little body first come to the light, but that his mental, moral and spiritual nature is still held in the psychical matrix of family life and molded by its influences quite as really as his physical being had been held and shaped by the life of the mother. The child of a genuinely religious home acquires religion naturally through association with his elders. Instruction in religion but furnishes him an explanation of the motives underlying the daily life in which he shares. He can understand the Fatherhood of God because of what he feels fatherhood to be in his own home. And his own delight in helping, sharing, and caring for others constitutes the beginning within him of experiences really Christian.

At some time or other in the adolescent years, religion presents itself for personal decision. God claims the maturing life. To each of His children

He comes in the way that seems to Him best. Some make the decision quietly, hardly knowing the crisis till it is past and they find themselves rejoicing in a new strength. Some make it in stress of spirit and penitence of soul, for conversion is for them a real turning about from the ways of darkness to those of light. But in any case, and whatever the form in which the issue presents itself, the turning of the soul to God is the more sure if religion has been growing within throughout all the years of childhood.

The other night, when two little boys were getting ready for bed, the younger, aged three, complained that he was afraid; and the mother, busy about her tasks, overheard the older, aged five, say something to him about "Trust." "What was that?" she asked. "Oh, I was just telling brother to do what I do when I feel afraid." "What do you do?" "I just say, 'In Thee do I put my trust,' and then I am not afraid. That is what Miss B. taught me in Sunday school." A child's magic talisman, the cynical will say; but who that knows children can doubt that here is a root of real religion? Imbedded in the soil of expanding experience and nourished in the life of a Christian home, one may hope that the little prayer will grow with the child who said it. If it does, one need not fear for the man that is to be.

FOR INVESTIGATION AND DISCUSSION

1. What do you understand by religion? In what sense is it a natural aspect of human life, and in what sense supernatural?

2. Discuss the characteristics of each of the three steps of growth in religion, which are distinguished in the chapter.

3. Why is religion a relatively objective affair to little children?

4. What do you think of the truth or falsehood of Dr. Lyttelton's position as reported in this chapter.

5. Give examples of children's questions which show how they are reworking their religious ideas and pressing on to more adequate concepts of God and of His relation to the world. State how you would answer each of these questions.

6. The importance of the child's life in the home as an apperceptive basis for his understanding of religion.

7. Describe various types of religious decision and of the conversion experience.

FOR FURTHER READING

Two splendid books are MRS. E. E. R. MUMFORD: "The Dawn of Religion in the Mind of the Child" and HUGH HARTSHORNE: "Childhood and Character." HORACE BUSHNELL'S "Christian Nurture" is a classic; and EDWARD LYTTELTON'S "The Cornerstone of Education" states like principles from the standpoint of an English schoolmaster. Practical counsels for the parent and teacher are in GEORGE HODGES: "The Training of Children in Religion" and L. A. WEIGLE and H. H. TWEEDY: "Training the Devotional Life."

CHAPTER XIII

WHY A TRAINED TEACHER?

WHY should one be trained to teach? Why, especially, should one be trained in methods of teaching? Is it not enough to know thoroughly the subject that one is to teach? Will not right methods then be followed naturally?

Such questions have been asked concerning education in general. The experience of the past forty or fifty years in America, as in England and France, has made clear the answer. The primary qualification of every teacher, of course, is to know his subject, completely and thoroughly and in relation to the rest of human knowledge. But a knowledge of subject-matter is not enough. To know is one thing; and to be able to teach is another. Right methods of teaching do not come naturally to every possessor of adequate knowledge and good intentions. Such methods are worked out slowly in the course of actual experience, just as methods are worked out in any other field of human endeavor. And the teacher of to-day, just as the worker in other fields, may profit by the experience of all who have gone before him and who are working with him. He may learn much from others, not simply about *what* to teach, but *how* to teach.

We hear it said sometimes that teachers are born not made. This aphorism has about as much truth when affirmed of teachers as it has when affirmed of business men, physicians, ministers, or any other class of workers who have much to do with people and with human values. There are born business men, born doctors—yes, born engineers and born farmers —in much the same sense as there are born musicians, born poets, and born teachers. For each of these vocations calls for certain qualifications of capacity and temperament which are matters of original endowment. Yet in each case success depends, not simply upon the indispensable original ability or aptitude, but upon training and opportunity. The work of the teacher is no exception to the rule. It would be a strange paradox if teachers, whose work is education, could not themselves be educated for that work. It is doubtless true that teachers are "born"; it does not follow that they are "not made."

Here and there, indeed, we do find some engaged in the work of teaching who imagine themselves to be teachers by the grace of God, born, not made, and excused by birthright from some of the pains and cares which necessity lays upon others. These good folk loftily sneer at "pedagogy" and seem to believe it their duty to present their subject in as difficult and uninteresting a fashion as they can, in order that their pupils may gain more mental "discipline" by conquering it.

But the world is going by these folk. The steady growth and development of normal schools, the increasing requirements for the certification of teach-

ers, the establishment of colleges of education and of departments of education in colleges and universities, the application of experimental methods to educational processes and to the measurement of the abilities and achievements of children, the organization and work of such professional bodies as the National Society for the Scientific Study of Education—these are some of the evidences of the movement in our time which is raising the work of the teacher to the level of a profession. Teaching is no longer a job for old women and incompetent men, and it is becoming less and less a stop-gap or stepping-stone for youngsters who are looking forward to other things. It has become a profession, conscious of its aims, intelligent in its methods, and possessed of a growing technique.

But why should one be trained to teach religion? it may still be asked. Religion is different from mathematics, science, or history. It is a way of life, rather than a body of ideas. It is the sort of thing, we sometimes hear it said, that must be "caught, not taught."

The answer is that a way of life can be taught quite as well as a body of ideas, provided we conceive education to be the vital process that it can and ought to be. So to present a way of life that it will be surely and rightly and permanently "caught" is to teach. And it is a sort of teaching that demands more, rather than less, trained skill, than the kind of teaching that aims simply to acquaint the pupil with ideas—if there be teaching of that kind.

Let us think simply of the Sunday school teacher.

Ought he or she to be trained to teach religion, as the public-school teacher is trained to teach other things? With full recognition of the differences between both the tasks and the salaries of the two types of teacher, one cannot but answer Yes. The Sunday school is not the public school, and cannot borrow its methods. But the Sunday school will not fully succeed until it does its own work as well relatively as the public school does the work that belongs to it. And that depends upon the Sunday school securing teachers as well trained relatively as those of the public school. We have a long way to go before that goal is reached; but that is no reason why we should not start.

Let two things be granted. First, that religion is not a merely human product. No teacher can beget it within a pupil if the grace of God be not there. But that is no reason why we should not equip ourselves in the best way that we can, and use every effort to accomplish our share in the redemption and religious education of God's children. We can always count on Him. The question is whether He can count on us.

Second, let it be granted that no teacher can beget religion within a pupil unless he possess religion himself. He cannot teach what he does not know; he cannot give what he does not have. A personal religious life is the primary qualification of a Sunday school teacher, just as a knowledge of subject-matter is the primary qualification of any other teacher. But personal consecration does not insure ability to teach religion to children, any more than knowl-

edge in any other field carries with it ability to teach. To personal religion, as to knowledge, must be added training. As a matter of fact, one may wonder whether that personal consecration is complete which uses itself as an excuse to evade the hard work of training for the Master's service.

The Sunday school is beginning to share in the general movement which is raising the standards of the teaching profession. Most of the considerations that have led to better training for teachers in general may be brought forward in support of better training for Sunday school teachers. We name just three fundamental reasons why one who is undertaking to teach religion in the Sunday school, even though possessed of a good general education and of a deep personal religious life, should seek by definite training to prepare himself for that work.

1. The Sunday school teacher deals with immature, growing minds. He dare not present his material in a merely logical order, therefore; his method must be psychological. He must understand children. He must be able to put his teaching in terms that match up with their experiences and answer to their problems and needs. He must know how things strike them and how to stir them to appreciation of the best. He must understand how their minds work and their wills develop; and he must know how to use the natural laws so revealed to him.

2. The Sunday school teacher deals with religion upon the level of conscious ideas. The children in his class are getting religion from many sources—

from the influences and experiences of home life, from association with others in acts of worship and in ways of living, from nature about them, and from the first vague stirrings of conscience within them. It is the business of the Sunday school teacher to bring together these manifold influences and to help them to express themselves in intelligent convictions. It is his function to explain life to children in religious terms. It is of the utmost importance, therefore, that his own ideas be clear and his beliefs well founded. He may not rest content, as some others may, with a religion merely personal, of pious habit but unintelligent, not thought through.

3. The Sunday school teacher must coöperate with other educational influences in the life of the children he teaches. The Sunday school does not have the whole job of education. The children are being educated as well by public school and home and Church, by libraries and moving-picture shows, by parties and picnics, public festivals, newspapers and posters, and by the whole round of sights and sounds and activities that characterize the life in which they find themselves. The Sunday school teacher must coöperate with, match up to, and interpret the various elements of this educative melange and seek to make them fall into a unity of life motived by religion. It is no easy task. To take the most obvious relation, the Sunday school teacher should both understand the teaching which his pupils are getting in the public schools and be able so to shape his own teaching in comparison with it, in point both of matter and method, that he will

command their attention and respect. And that means that he must be as well trained relatively as the week-day teachers of his children.

FOR INVESTIGATION AND DISCUSSION

1. In what sense may we properly speak of a "born teacher"?
2. What are some essential qualifications of a good teacher?
3. What qualifications, if any, additional to these should the Sunday school teacher possess?
4. Discuss the three reasons given in the text why a Sunday school teacher should have definite training to teach.
5. Describe some successful methods for the training of Sunday school teachers.

FOR FURTHER READING

G. H. PALMER, in "The Ideal Teacher," describes the qualifications of teachers in general; G. H. BETTS, in "How to Teach Religion," the qualifications, aims and methods of teachers of religion. W. S. ATHEARN, in "Religious Education and American Democracy," and in "A National System of Education" presents convincingly the argument for better church schools and for trained teachers. In "The City Institute for Religious Teachers" the same author describes a method for the training of teachers which, under his guidance, has passed the experimental stage.

CHAPTER XIV

THE TEACHER'S KNOWLEDGE OF THE LESSON

I REMEMBER that, as a student in high school and college, I used to think that my teachers had a far easier time than I. Their schedule of class hours was much less exacting, I thought, and they could go over the same old material year after year; moreover, they had the inestimable advantage of being able to keep their books open throughout the whole recitation and to refer to these whenever they chose.

Since becoming a teacher, I have found out that the easier task is that of the student. The teacher must know so much more and must study so much harder than I had thought. Every class makes demands upon its teacher far greater than any that he can make upon it.

The teacher must not simply know the lesson; *he must know it in such a way that he can cause others to know it.* That is much more difficult. It means that he must understand his pupils as well as the lesson itself, and that he must be able to present it clearly and in such fashion as to arouse their interest, command their attention and set them to work upon it. He will fail if he be lacking in any one of

three respects: in his mastery of the subject, in his understanding of his pupils, or in his ability to bring the two together.

We are now to think only of the first of these qualifications of the teacher; in subsequent chapters we shall think of the other two. The teacher's mastery of the lesson material cannot be too complete and thorough. "Oh, I cannot teach a Sunday school class. I do not know enough" is perhaps the most frequent excuse given to pastors and superintendents who are seeking new teachers. And all too often the statement is true. The person asked does not know enough to be a good teacher, without a definite course of preparation, not simply in psychology and pedagogy, but in the subject-matter itself which is to be taught. But that is no reason why he should not accept the responsibility and undertake courses of study which will in time cause him to know enough.

In these days of graded lessons and of graded adaptations even of the Uniform Lessons, we are rightly laying great emphasis upon the principle that the child should be the center of the curriculum. Understand your children and fit your teaching to their needs, is the watchword of every convention, institute, and teacher-training class. It is well that it should be so. It is a counsel that the Sunday school has sorely needed and needs to-day. It cannot be over-emphasized.

But we must not forget the other side. The child is not the sole determining factor. We must have something to give to our children. We must be

able to wake them to needs which they would not otherwise feel. We must have knowledge and skill to guide them into the truth. We shall fail if we do not ourselves understand the great eternal principles of right and mercy and truth which God has taught the world through His life among men and in men, and most of all through His revelation of Himself in Christ Jesus. It is that knowledge above all else that our children need, as they become able to understand it. And that knowledge constitutes the subject-matter of Sunday school teaching.

A common bane of Sunday school teaching has been the haziness of the teacher's own ideas concerning the truths of religion. Too many teachers are just good, well-meaning Christian folk, whose beliefs are rooted in a surface soil of authority or convention and ultimately grounded in a loyal devotion to the right as it is given them to see the right, but who have never attained to any clear and consistent view of just what they believe and why they believe. Practically, volitionally, emotionally, they are all right—sound and true Christians; but their intellectual grasp of religion is not all that it should be. They have never thought their beliefs through. They have never gotten adequate and clear ideas concerning the deeper motives of their own lives.

But is this necessary? one may ask. Are not Paul's letters full of rejoicing that the gospel is not merely to the wise—and more than that, of condemnation for the wise in their own conceits? May not one be a good Christian without knowing very much? The answer must be Yes—and No. One

can indeed be a good Christian without understanding all about theology, or even without knowing very much save that God is his Father and Christ his Saviour. But no Christian has placed his faith upon a permanent basis until he has understood it in terms consistent with his general circle of ideas and beliefs respecting the world about him and life as a whole. And surely no Christian who undertakes to teach another should rest content with anything less than the clearest understanding of the truth that he can gain. For the work of the teacher moves largely upon the level of conscious ideas. "I had rather speak five words with my understanding, that I might teach others also, than ten thousand words in a tongue." The teacher is set to edify others; and for that he needs understanding.

But is it possible? one may ask again. Can we gain a clear intellectual understanding of the truths of religion? Are they not too great for our minds to grasp? Is there not a certain point beyond which we must just believe? Again the answer must be Yes—and No. It is true that our finite minds cannot comprehend the whole of the infinite wisdom of God; and true that He has hidden many things from us and thus given us what is better than knowledge —the opportunity to believe in Him, to trust Him, and in loyal faith to live and work as though seeing that which is as yet unseen. But that does not mean that we cannot understand God and His ways, nor that we must "just believe" without rational grounds, in blind and unintelligent credulity. Faith is different from credulity. It both underlies knowl-

edge and grows out of knowledge. It has grounds that are rational and conditions that may be defined. Every teacher ought to know something of the logic of belief and understand what sort of evidence we are justified in seeking for our fundamental faiths.

"To teach even a small thing well, one must be large," wrote Prof. George Herbert Palmer in a notable passage on "The Ideal Teacher." The teacher's knowledge of any particular lesson springs out of and in a sense reflects all that the teacher is and knows. Certainly a Sunday school teacher's knowledge of any particular lesson does not depend simply upon his specific study of that one bit of material; it is rooted and grounded in the whole of his personal religious life and in the body of ideas that have come in his mind to underlie and express that life. Only that teacher who both is a Christian and knows why he is a Christian, who has a true and adequate knowledge of the Bible as a whole and has thought through as well as lived through its teachings, will be sure to get the meaning of each lesson as it comes and to teach it with effectiveness and power.

Sunday school teachers stand in especial need of Professor Palmer's counsel. One of the greatest limitations of Sunday school teaching in general, in addition to the intellectual haziness of which we have been thinking, has been the hand-to-mouth method of lesson preparation which so many teachers have followed. It has perhaps been fostered, quite unintentionally, by the International system of dated lessons, with various lesson helps published

just in time to be used. This hand-to-mouth method, again, has fostered the general tendency toward pious moralizing which is the line of least resistance for the poorly prepared teacher. I remember one of my own teachers—luckily for a short time only—whose invariable method of abusing our minds was to ask one of the class to read a verse, then to ask: "Now, what do we learn from that?" Receiving no answer, usually, he would take that verse as a text for a little sermon; then he would proceed to the next verse, which would be treated in the same way.

The newer lessons, both graded and improved uniform, do not lend themselves as readily to treatment of this sort. They bring out more explicitly the continuity of Biblical history and the coherence of Christian truth. They make greater demands upon the mental powers of both teacher and pupil. But the knowledge that they make possible is worth the effort. And the Sunday school must raise itself to a higher level, intellectually, if it is to occupy its place among the educational institutions of our day and live up to its opportunity and responsibility.

The newer teacher-training courses, too, are placing larger emphasis upon adequate knowledge. The time was, within the memory of many of us, when one was considered to be "trained to teach" if he had drilled into his memory the books of the Bible, an outline of Biblical history, and sundry lists of persons, places, dates, and the like. With the more definite recognition of the principle of gradation, larger emphasis was laid upon psychology and much

upon devices of method in teaching. Without lessening of effort along these lines, we now see more clearly the importance of replacing the Biblical drill of earlier days with courses which will equip the teacher with that broad and thorough knowledge of subject-matter which is a primary qualification for effective teaching.

FOR INVESTIGATION AND DISCUSSION

1. Can one be a good Christian without having a clear intellectual grasp of the doctrines of the Christian religion? Give reasons for your answer.
2. Can one be a good Sunday school teacher without clear ideas respecting the fundamental convictions and doctrines of the Christian religion? Give reasons for your answer.
3. What do you understand by faith as contrasted with and as related to knowledge? What sort of evidence are we justified in seeking for our fundamental faiths? How are you going to explain faith to your Sunday school class?
4. What are some of the steps involved in the teacher's preparation of each lesson?
5. Are the graded lessons harder to teach than the old uniform lesson? Give reasons for your answer.
6. What are some of the differences between the older and newer courses for the training of Sunday school teachers?

FOR FURTHER READING

BURTON and MATHEWS: "Principles and Ideals for the Sunday School"; G. H. BETTS: "How to Teach Religion"; J. M. GREGORY: "The Seven Laws of Teaching."

CHAPTER XV

THE TEACHING PROCESS

THREE weeks after the opening of college, one year, a senior of high standing presented himself at the office of the dean, with the request that he be permitted to drop a certain course and substitute another in a different department. "But I thought you had spoken to me last year of how happily you looked forward to that course," objected the dean. "What is the matter?" "I still want the subject," was the answer; "and I think that Professor So-and-so is the most brilliant man I know; but honestly, dean, he is the poorest teacher I know too."

The dean decided to attend a few sessions of that class. At the end he felt much as the student did. Professor So-and-so was a brilliant man, there was no denying that; perhaps the best scholar on the faculty. But he was not a good teacher. He did all the talking himself; and what he said was richly suggestive, often profound, at times sparkling with the wit that was native to the man, and always abounding in allusions and side references that bore evidence to the encyclopedic scope of his knowledge. But his material lacked organization and adaptation. He did not begin at a natural beginning, lead

out into a well-ordered body of exposition, and drive through to a conclusive end. He never seemed clear as to just what he might presuppose his pupils to know. He made no effort, apparently, to put himself upon their level and to adapt what he said to their interests and needs; he frequently dived straight into whatever phase of the subject chanced at the time to be uppermost in his own thinking or investigation. If occasionally he became uneasily conscious that perhaps not all of his audience had been able to dive with him, he began to flounder. He lugged in stories; he multiplied explanations, laborious and out of place; he backed and turned and filled in, all with an air of the utmost patience and with a trace of condescension. He entertained the superficial; he mystified the earnest; and the best students took him as a sort of condiment, and mastered the subject almost as much in spite of him as because of him.

The exhibition that Professor So-and-so gave before his classes, in short, was not *teaching*. He went about it as though he were put there to get the lesson *out* of his system, rather than *into* the pupil's.

His procedure was mistaken in two fundamental respects. First, he assumed that *telling* things to pupils is teaching them. Now telling undoubtedly has its place in the teaching process—at times when the teacher finds it best to tell facts to his pupils which they cannot find out for themselves, or would find out only at the expense of too much time and effort; when he is called upon to explain some diffi-

cult point, to illustrate some principle, or to clear up some obscurity that they cannot of themselves understand; when he seeks to awaken desirable emotions and to arouse right attitudes within them by the concrete and stirring presentation of some story or poem, bit of history or biography.

But such telling is more or less incidental; it is part of a larger teaching process. To teach is to arouse the pupils themselves to mental activity, and to direct and guide that activity. The teacher who tells everything to his class is not apt to stir them to think for themselves. They will sit more or less inert, receiving impressions but not digesting them. And he has no way to check up what is happening within them. He cannot tell whether they are getting right or wrong impressions. He is so busy pouring in that he does not stop to draw out. For all he knows, they may be acquiring ideas that are oddly distorted or almost wholly false.

Yet how often one meets a Sunday school teacher who says with a certain air of pride: "You know, my class wants me to do all the talking. They say that they enjoy it so." Of course they do, because that is the lazy, happy-go-lucky way for them. They need do no work if the teacher will do it all. The poor misguided teacher follows them along the line of least resistance, and accepts it as a tribute to his ability as an attractive, interesting talker.

Professor So-and-so's second fundamental mistake was his failure to adapt his teaching to the knowledge and experience, the interests and purposes, of his pupils. He kept handing out to them

what was in his head, without taking account of what was in their heads.

He was essaying an impossible thing. No teacher can simply take an idea out of his own head and put it into a pupil's head, unchanged, as though it were a sort of brick. All that the teacher can do is to express, in words and in his control of the pupil's experiences, what his ideas are, and thereby to stimulate and guide the pupil to formulate adequate and true ideas for himself. The pupil makes his own ideas; no one can do that for him. And he always makes his ideas in part of old material. He understands the new only by associating it with the old; he grasps the hitherto unknown only in terms of its relations to what he has already known. This is the familiar elemental principle of *apperception.*

One of the first essentials of good teaching, therefore, is that it begins at the level of the pupil's knowledge and experience. The teacher should seek to understand, as fully as possible, what his pupils already know; and he should come into living, sympathetic touch with their aspirations and interests. This previous knowledge, these aspirations and interests, constitute the stuff with which he has to help them build the new structure of ideas and purposes at which he aims. Unless he knows that stuff and how to use it, there will always remain an element of uncertainty about his work. He cannot be quite sure that his pupils are going away with just the ideas that he wanted them to get.

One of the most remarkable things about Jesus' teaching is the way that he used the stuff that was al-

ready in the minds of his hearers. He never taught abstractly. He was constantly asking questions that drew men out. He was always ready with some concrete case, some figure of speech, analogy, or story that made his teaching clear to the common run of folk. It is important, moreover, to note the sort of things that he told stories about—about fishermen and their nets, a shepherd and his sheep, a sower and his seed; about the weeds that grow up to choke the grain; about sons, obedient and disobedient, stay-at-home and prodigal; about a woman and her yeast; about another woman, her money and her broom; about wedding feasts and marriage processions; about debtors, thieves, and judges; about an absent landlord and a cheating rent-agent; about a man, even, who gets out of bed at midnight to lend a neighbor bread, lest his continued knocking upon the door should wake the children.

These are stories of ordinary, every-day life. Things like these were happening all the while among the people to whom he spoke. And that is just why he was able to turn these stories to such splendid account, and to convey through them the most profound of spiritual truths. He was using the material that was at hand. "The common people heard him gladly." That was in part, at least, because they could understand him. His teaching was put in terms drawn from their experience, and answered to their needs.

Here are two principles, then, that are in the nature of the case fundamental to the teaching process. The teacher must rouse the pupil to think and

do for himself; and he must help the pupil to use what knowledge he already possesses as a basis for his understanding of new experiences and his construction of new ideas.

There is a simple test which any teacher can apply, to learn whether or not he is doing these two things. Do your pupils study their lessons? Or do they simply come to class and expect you to entertain them or to direct their study for the hour that you are together? If you have not succeeded in creating within them, not simply willingness but a desire to do something upon their lessons between meetings of the class, you may be sure that your teaching is not getting *into* them as it should. Many Sunday school teachers resign themselves too readily to the idea that "You can't get pupils to study their Sunday school lesson any more." It is harder, of course, than it was in days less full of distractions than these. But it can be done. And it depends, in the main, upon the teacher himself and upon the character of the process that he conducts under the name of teaching.

FOR INVESTIGATION AND DISCUSSION

1. Can you recall any teacher whom you have had, who was very brilliant, yet could not teach? What was his trouble?

2. What are the functions and what are the limitations of telling in the teaching process?

3. What is the psychological principle of apperception, and what is its bearing upon the teaching process?

4. What is meant by the point of contact in teaching?

5. Is the test of good teaching fair, which is proposed in the last paragraph of the chapter?

FOR FURTHER READING

J. M. GREGORY: "The Seven Laws of Teaching"; STRAYER and NORSWORTHY: "How to Teach"; G. H. BETTS: "How to Teach Religion." The well-known little book on "The Point of Contact in Teaching" by PATTERSON DUBOIS should be read by every teacher. On Jesus' methods see the chapter in WENDT'S "The Teaching of Jesus" and B. A. HINSDALE: "Jesus as a Teacher," or—best of all—T. R. GLOVER'S "The Jesus of History."

CHAPTER XVI

HOW TO EXCITE INTEREST

HOW to excite interest is an old problem—as old as teaching itself. Yet it is ever new; you face it each time that you meet a class.

About A. D. 400 one Deogratias, a deacon in the Christian church at Carthage, was much troubled by this problem. One of his duties was to instruct the candidates for baptism. But he seems to have been rather lengthy in discourse and prosy in manner, so that his lectures became tedious, he confessed, even to himself. In distress, he wrote to the best teacher that he knew, Augustine, and asked his advice.

Augustine answered with a little book, "On the Catechising of the Uninstructed," which is full of insight and good sense. It is a teacher's duty to be interesting, he urges; and he proceeds, out of his own experience, to show Deogratias how to go about it. Not only to know his subject thoroughly, but to prepare it carefully, and in due perspective, for the purpose of teaching it to each separate group; to take account of his pupils' previous knowledge and varying types of ability and motive; to understand their points of view and to adapt his teaching to these; to be himself cheerful in manner and

interested in what he is doing; to keep continually alert to any signs of misunderstanding or lack of interest on the part of his hearers, and to be prompt and resourceful in meeting such exigencies—these are some of Augustine's counsels.

"It often happens," he says, "that one who at first listened to us with all readiness becomes exhausted and gapes and yawns and even unwillingly exhibits a disposition to depart. When we observe that, it becomes our duty to refresh his mind by saying something seasoned with an honest cheerfulness and adapted to the matter which is being discussed, or something of a very wonderful and amazing order, or even, it may be, something of a painful and mournful nature. Whatever we thus say may be all the better if it affects himself more immediately, so that the quick sense of self-concern may keep his attention on the alert. At the same time, however, it should not offend his spirit of reverence by any harshness, but rather win him by its friendliness."

This is good pedagogy. When the pupil's attention wanders, the teacher's first concern must be to win it back. And his appeal must be, not to compulsion, or to mere effort of will, but to interest. For modern psychology has made it clearer than it was even to so good a teacher as Augustine, that no pupil does his best, except when his whole mind is engaged in interested attention.

But how? some Deogratias will ask; how can I set to work not merely to excite, but to hold and direct the interest of my pupils? There can be no

set recipe. Each teacher faces, for each lesson, his own problem. But certain general counsels may be given, in the light of which the problem of each day may be solved.

1. *Get interested in the lesson yourself.* Study it until you find something which sets your mind aglow. You cannot hope to arouse enthusiasm within your pupils if your own attitude toward what you are teaching is one merely of dutiful routine.

2. *Ask yourself just why you are interested in that particular thing.* Is it because of previous experiences or present purposes, native temperament, education, or reading, or travel? Then ask yourself the all-important question to which this introspection is but preliminary: *Will what has interested me in this matter interest my pupils also?* Is their experience enough like mine to make this same angle of approach as interesting to them as it is to me? Sometimes you can honestly answer, Yes: and then your way is easy, unless you find, when you actually confront them, that you have made a mistake. But sometimes your answer must be No. What is interesting to yourself, you see even in anticipation, will not be interesting to your pupils. Its value to you depends too much upon characteristics or experiences which they do not share.

3. *Find the angle of approach that will interest your pupils.* You can do this only by understanding them well enough to share their point of view. You must know what experiences they are having; in what occupations, at work or play, they are engaged; what their ambitions are—what, in short, are

the things that actually do interest them from day to day. And you must let these determine your avenue of approach to the new things in which you seek to enlist their interest.

The interests to which you may appeal are of three sorts: (1) General interests. Some things are of interest to everybody at certain times. Anything directly connected with the war, for example, enlisted the immediate interest and attention of any group of men or women or children throughout the past six years, provided it was the sort of thing that they could in a measure understand. (2) Group interests. Some things are of special interest to the particular social group to which your pupils belong. These interests differ for the sexes, and change with increasing age. The so-called "gang instinct" in boys, with its associated interests, to take a familiar example, may appear at eight or nine, is apt to be at its height between eleven and fourteen, and then gradually disappears, or is incorporated into a higher system of interests. (3) Individual interests, determined by the special aptitudes, experiences, and ambitions of individual pupils. To understand these, you must enter as a friend into the life of each boy and girl who comes into your class.

4. *Have something new to give to your pupils.* If you do no more than repeat familiar things, however attractive these may be, you will be sure to lose their interest and attention. We human folks, old and young, are incurably curious. We are eager for new knowledge and fresh experiences. And to these we pay full attention, while we accept the old

and familar in a matter-of-course, habitual, and more or less unthinking way. You should always be prepared, therefore, with more material than was in the text-book; always bring something to class that was not accessible to your pupils. Know more than they do, and use your knowledge to feed their interest.

5. *Make your pupils feel their need of what you bring them.* Beginning as you do with their own ideas and interests, you should so shape your questions as to reveal to them the incompleteness of what they already know, and so give them a motive to seek the new knowledge which the lesson offers. Every lesson should begin, in a sense, by raising a problem in the pupil's minds, which they then set themselves to solve. A class of sixteen-year-old boys was apathetically droning over the account of the three Hebrew princes whom Nebuchadnezzar threw into the fiery furnace, when the supervisor, who had "dropped in," asked: "Do you think that those three princes knew that God would deliver them from the fiery furnace?" "Of course," was the unanimous reply. "Then what was there heroic in their action?" "Why—I never thought of that," said one boy. "Take your Bibles and read it all over again carefully, then answer." The question had shown the boys a defect in their body of ideas. They set to work with a will, and soon found the "But if not," which attests the moral heroism of the three Hebrew princes; and there were no lagging minds throughout the rest of that lesson period.

6. *Teach as concretely as you can.* That is a fa-

miliar counsel, which needs no elaboration. Many teachers do not realize, however, how much more interested pupils are in a map or diagram or picture that is constructed right before their eyes, in immediate connection with the bit of teaching that it is meant to illustrate, than in other maps or diagrams or pictures that may be far more perfect, but are ready-made or constructed beforehand and brought in for exhibition. Every class, of course, ought to have its own blackboard, which the teacher should use freely and effectively.

7. *Make your teaching direct and practical.* Teachers of religion are handicapped in comparison with public-school teachers, because their work brings less immediate and obvious results. A boy of six, who had attended Sunday school for two years with eager and happy interest, surprised his father one Sunday, some two months after he had entered public school, by saying, "I don't want to go to Sunday school." "Why?" the puzzled father asked. "Because you don't learn anything there." His little mind was busy day after day with such fascinating practical arts as reading, writing, and figuring; and in comparison with these, he felt that the Sunday school had nothing to offer.

Here is a real handicap. We cannot wholly escape it, for the Sunday school seeks to develop motives, ideals, and obligations rather than to train in particular habits of skill. But we can do much to minimize it; and we can overcome it if we will only teach vitally and practically enough, and if we will lead our pupils in living and doing as well as in

learning. Every Sunday school class ought to be a service unit; active, not simply mobilized. And every teacher misses his largest opportunity, as well as the surest method of enlisting and holding the interest of his pupils, who fails to center the intellectual aspects of his work about the practical problems and enterprises of their associated life in Christian service.

FOR INVESTIGATION AND DISCUSSION

1. What do you understand by interest, and what is its relation to attention?
2. What are the factors which determine the direction of one's interest?
3. What is the best way to begin a lesson? What is meant in the traditional lesson plan by the step of preparation? Can all lessons begin by raising a problem?
4. Methods of making the lesson concrete.
5. Can we make the teaching of religion as immediately practical as the teaching of the public school? Give reasons for your answer.
6. The relation of interest and effort in the educative process. Ought we interest children or keep them at work or do both?

FOR FURTHER READING

The books by GREGORY, DUBOIS and BETTS listed in the last chapter; J. DEWEY: "Interest and Effort in Education"; J. G. FITCH: "The Art of Securing Attention"; G. H. BETTS: "The Recitation"; J. ADAMS: "Primer of Teaching."

CHAPTER XVII

LEARNING BY DOING

THAT we learn by doing is an old and familiar maxim. Yet teachers often forget it, or fail to live up to it. To ask pupils to learn by reading or by talking is much less trouble, and seems more direct.

But the reading and talking method does not insure that the pupil gets real and adequate ideas, or that he develops the inclination or ability to apply these ideas in action. It may mean that his work in the class-room deals with mere words, and that his real education—his actual understanding of life and equipment for it—is something apart, to which the words he studies bear no vital relation.

In the Sunday school we are concerned directly with the issues of life itself—with character, service, destiny, and love to God and man. These can never be taught simply by talking about them. Every Sunday school class ought to be organized for service as well as for instruction; every Sunday school teacher ought to be a leader in Christian life and an inspirer of Christian deeds as well as an expositor of Christian beliefs. This is the special application to our work of the old maxim concerning learning by doing. In a later chapter of this book we shall discuss it in some detail.

There is another application of the maxim which

the Sunday school shares with the public school, though both have only begun in late years to understand and practice it. In the process of instruction it is important not only to appeal to the eyes and ears of pupils, and to get them to use their tongues, but to give their hands an opportunity to do something. Illustrative hand-work is a type of educational activity which is comparatively new in most schools, and which is developing rapidly in profitable directions, not as an end in itself, but as a method of study, recitation, and instruction.

In connection with their public-school work in history, literature, and geography, for example, children may be encouraged to construct sand-table representations of historical scenes such as the landing of the Pilgrims or the battle of Quebec, of poems such as "Evangeline," or "Snowbound," of stories such as "The Three Bears" or "Rip van Winkle"; models of Colonial homes, Fulton's steamboat, an early railroad train, or the locks of the Panama Canal; relief maps of various countries, sand-table representations of their industries, and models of castles on the Rhine, the dikes of Holland, the suspension bridge at Niagara Falls, and the like. The range of possible subjects for such hand-work is almost as wide as the school curriculum itself.

Teachers who have tried it are finding out that work of this sort has four chief advantages:

1. It engages the interest and attention of the pupils. They are eagerly absorbed in these tasks as they would not be in mere reading or writing or speaking.

2. It helps them to do clear thinking, and to get definite ideas and impressions. Many of us older folk would find out what vague ideas we have concerning such subjects, if we set to work to picture them in these ways. A child gets a clearer idea of what Colonial homes were like, and what sort of clothes people wore in those days, if he sees, handles, and makes models which give concrete shape to the descriptions he hears and reads.

3. It helps pupils to express what they know. Some pupils do best in oral recitation; some when they write; and others are more or less at a loss for words to speak or write, but love to make and handle things and can express themselves best in this way. Schools have too often placed a premium upon the ability to use language, and have neglected pupils of this last, more concrete-minded type. Yet in the world at large it is the doer, rather than the mere talker or writer, who is held in high esteem. "It is a good thing," writes a teacher of experience, "for such a pupil sometimes to feel a thrill of pride in having surpassed his classmates instead of always being outstripped by them. Such an experience sometimes helps to overcome obstacles in the way of his success in other forms of expression. His interest in the thing he has made overcomes his diffidence, and he tells easily how the work was done, and what it implies." [1]

4. It supplies pupils with a motive for study. The

[1] The quotation is from Miss Ella V. Dobbs. Her books on "Primary Hand-work" and "Illustrative Hand-work" are interesting, direct and practical. Though they deal with public-school work only, the Sunday school teacher will find them very helpful.

boy who is to make a sand-table representation of the battle of Quebec, for example, will seek all the information he can get concerning its topography and the course of events on that fateful day upon the plains of Abraham. And he will not be satisfied with general statements; this information must be precise enough to be worked out in a model that can stand the criticism of the other members of the class. He will read and study with greater interest and care, because he has an immediate use for these facts.

Sunday school teachers who have tried it are finding the same advantages in such freely expressive work. It was a great step forward when we first realized, some years ago, that pupils might use their hands as well as their tongues in the Sunday school class. But too commonly the hand-work that we have offered to our pupils has been of a strictly defined, almost dictated type. Their books have contained printed questions and little spaces in which an answer to each could be written—just so long and no more. When a picture could be used to advantage, these books have left a neatly outlined space for it, furnished the picture, and left nothing to the pupil except the mechanical act of pasting. If a decorative border seemed in place, these books have printed one and told the pupil to color it—suggesting, very likely, the particular color that he should use for each detail. It is small wonder that pupils are not interested in this sort of thing after the first novelty wears off. It is all so cut-and-dried, so formal and mechanical. It affords the pupil no op-

portunity for choice, for initiative, for free expression of his own ideas; it gives him no motive for study. It is hand-work that enlists nothing else than hands.

The more freely expressive types of hand-work are possible to the Sunday school just as to the public school. Drawing and coloring, paper-cutting and paper-tearing, poster-making and book-making, are methods of great value if pupils be given opportunity through them to express their own ideas, rather than merely to give a mechanical finish to those of somebody else. Biblical history, literature, and geography lend themselves to illustration by the same methods of map-making, sand-table representation, modeling, and construction which are used in connection with the corresponding subjects in the public schools. The whole field of Christian missions, moreover, is a much-needed part of the religious education of our children, which opens to the Sunday school a range of subjects for such educative hand-work which is almost as wide as that possessed by the public school.

Three questions are raised in the minds of most superintendents when they think of undertaking this type of hand-work in their schools: When shall we have time for it? How shall we meet the expense? How can we get competent teachers? Even here, the experience of the public school may guide us toward the answer to these questions. The book on "Illustrative Hand-work," which was quoted above, was written to prove, among other things, "that work of this kind not only has a place as a regular

form of study and recitation, but that it can be done without exceeding the limit of time allotted to the subject; that the equipment and materials needed are easily obtainable in any school; that work of this kind may be carried on in the regular classroom; that such methods may be used by teachers who have not been trained in the manual arts."

Illustrative hand-work in the Sunday school will not so much demand additional time as vitalize and make more profitable our use of the time that we have. It will cost more for the Sunday school, relatively, than for the public school; but that is only because the Sunday school has been proceeding upon the policy of spending almost nothing for educative materials. At most, it costs little; and children may be encouraged to utilize much material that otherwise would go to waste.

The real problem is that of the teachers. They must be trained in methods, or they will waste time and may fail; and they must be better trained in biblical history, literature, and geography, for they will no longer be able to put their pupils off with vague verbal descriptions. But this training is not an impossible task. As a matter of fact, teachers as well as children will be more interested in such work than in many less tangible things. The training should be practical and concrete, leading the teachers themselves to do the kinds of hand-work that they will propose to their pupils; and it should be given to the teachers of each department separately, with a view to their own specific problems and opportunities. It is natural to begin with the teachers of the Junior

Department, since it is in this department that such methods are of relatively greatest value.

FOR INVESTIGATION AND DISCUSSION

1. Observe the use of illustrative hand-work in the public schools. What are some of its advantages and possible disadvantages?

2. What is meant by the project method of teaching as this is employed in many public schools? What are its advantages and possible disadvantages?

3. Discuss the possibility of employing project methods in the teaching of the Sunday school.

4. What are some of the differences between the illustrative hand-work described in this chapter and the hand-work which has commonly been employed in the Sunday school?

5. What further steps are needed in the training of teachers, if they are to use such methods of hand-work?

FOR FURTHER READING

ELLA V. DOBBS: "Primary Hand-Work" and "Illustrative Hand-work"; M. S. LITTLEFIELD: "Hand-Work in the Sunday School"; A. G. WARDLE: "Hand-Work in Religious Education." For the principles underlying the project method of teaching as this is used in the public schools see JOHN DEWEY: "School and Society" and "Democracy and Education"; and I. E. MILLER: "Education for the Needs of Life."

CHAPTER XVIII

ATTENTION—ITS NATURE AND LAWS

"ATTENTION!" is the most familiar of military commands. It means not only that the soldier shall stand with body erect, heels together, eyes front, and hands at sides, but that his mind shall be alert, ready to hear, understand and obey further commands.

Attention is an attribute of intelligence and will. It characterizes activity that is distinctly mental, as contrasted with that which is merely physical, instinctive or habitual. If the mind be thought of as a tool, attention is its keen cutting edge. Liken it to a theater, and attention is its spotlight; to a camera, and attention is its focus.

Attention is sometimes involuntary. One's attention is naturally attracted by stimuli that are sudden, intense, strange, unusual, rhythmic or recurrent, by pains, hunger-pangs or other signals of organic needs, by quick changes and sharp contrasts, or by anything moving. It is one of nature's provisions for our safety that we should be made to notice things like these, which are so often the signs of danger.

When not thus involuntary, attention is in general directed by interest, which may be either (1)

immediate or remote, (2) native or acquired. Interest is immediate when the present activity or object of attention is interesting or satisfying in itself; remote when it is attended to only because it is seen to be a means to a further end. Interest is native when determined by some one or more of the great instinctive tendencies or capacities which constitute original human nature; acquired when determined by ideas or habits which have been gained in the course of experience.

The most significant distinction is that between attention which is relatively spontaneous, because whole-minded, and that which involves strain and effort, because of distracting impulses. When some interest gains full possession of the mind—whether it be immediate or remote, native or acquired—attention is easy, and one does his best mental work. When, on the other hand, one is not fully interested in the task at hand, conscious of conflicting impulses and open to distraction, attention is difficult. It takes effort to resist the more alluring things and to hold one's mind to the chosen object. And the mind, naturally, does not work quite as well under these forced conditions.

Attention may be directed either to the things of sense-perception or to ideas and thoughts. If the former, it is termed sensorial; if the latter, ideational. In either case, an object is apt to hold one's interest and attention so long as (1) it offers something to be found out or learned, some problem to be solved, something fresh to be experienced; (2) it does not wholly baffle the efforts of attention

to discover its qualities or to solve its problems, but begins to yield dividends in the way of insight or control or the promise of either; (3) these early dividends of insight or result are enough in line with one's established standards of worth to be satisfying. No object, whether material or ideational, will command sustained interest and attention if it is too familiar, if it is too difficult or baffling, or if it begins to yield fruits that seem worthless.

When attention's work is done on any bit of material, it moves on to something else. It is a familiar fact that attention cannot long be kept, even through effort of will, upon an unchanging object. Inevitably it begins to wander, and we find ourselves thinking of something else. The reason is obvious. Attention is an instrument of adaptation. It was given us to discover and understand things with, that we might the better adapt ourselves to the situations in which we are placed and control our environment. As soon as it has found out what it can concerning a given object and solved, so far as it can see, the problem presented by the situation, its work is done. That thing is known; that adaptation made. Now what next?

The directions in which one's attention naturally tends, and in which one is able to give sustained attention, depend, it is clear, upon the ideas, instincts, aptitudes, habits and experiences which one already has. This is one meaning of the familiar principle of apperception—that we grasp the unknown only by relating it to the already known, that we understand the new in terms of the old. In any situation,

we see what experience has prepared us to see, we pay attention to those things to which our interests predispose us, we understand what we are fitted to understand. I remember meeting a man on the return voyage from Europe, some years ago, who talked only of the horses that he had seen in the various cities and countries which he had visited, despite the fact that he was a member of a Cook's touring party, which had made the customary journey under guidance to the well-known circle of historic and scenic places. In time he told me his business, and then it was explained. He was a ranchman from Montana.

These principles and laws apply to the attention of little children as well as to that of adults. But their results are different, because children lack the experience of older folk. It is highly important that the teacher of children should understand the respects in which they differ from adults in power to pay attention.

1. The child is less able than the adult to pay attention to ideas. His attention is primarily sensorial, rather than ideational. He is a discoverer in what is to him a new and fascinating world. He is eager to see, hear, touch, handle, do and make things. His interests are immediate, rather than remote. They are determined by his native instincts, rather than by acquired habits and ideas—for he has not had time to get any considerable stock of the latter. Observe a child and an adult out for a walk together, and see how the child is attracted by every sense stimulus, while the adult is occupied, rather,

with the memories and ideas which are suggested by his sense impressions.

2. Children cannot apprehend as many things at once as adults can. Experiments have shown that the average grown-up can comprehend from four to five unrelated objects in one flash of vision, but that children cannot apprehend as many. Adults, moreover, can hold a great many related items together before the mind, in a complex system of associated facts, which becomes for them, to all practical purposes, a unitary object of thought and attention. Children can make few such connections. It is hard for them to think of more than one point at a time.

3. Closely related to this is the fact that children cannot do as many things at once as adults can. An experienced chauffeur can use eyes, hand and feet in driving his car, yet converse with the friend beside him. The beginner can do no such feat. Remembering the clutch, he is apt to forget the brake; putting his mind on shifting gears, he lets his engine "die." Now, little children are beginners at almost everything. Learning to ride an Irish Mail, a child forgets to steer when he remembers to pull, and fails to pull when he remembers to steer. Learning to read or write or spell, he centers his attention on one aspect of the process at a time; and he makes progress only so fast as he gets the habits which make mechanical various aspects of these operations. We are too often unjustly impatient with children when we call their attention to something that we wish them to know or do, only to find that

while thinking of it they forget or fail in other things.

4. Children are not able to continue attention to a given object or occupation for so long a period of time as adults. They lose interest more quickly, and their attention wanders. This is a natural consequence of their smaller experience and relative poverty of ideas. Attention, we have seen, cannot be kept long upon an unchanging object. If it is to be continued the object must reveal new aspects or one's thoughts concerning it must develop. But the child's thoughts cannot develop very far; he soon comes to the end of his resources. And after he has seen in the object or situation all that his limited experience fits him to see, his attention moves on to something else.

5. Children are more easily distracted than older folk, and less able to force themselves to pay attention. This, too, is a consequence of their relative poverty of experience. They do not enter deeply enough into most things to be really absorbed, and they have no adequate body of ideas to back and sustain the effort to resist distractions and hold their minds to a chosen task. It is the teacher's business, not to demand or to command the attention of his children, but rather to teach so concretely and well that he will engage their interest and capture their attention.

FOR INVESTIGATION AND DISCUSSION

1. What do you understand by attention, and what is its relation to interest? Discuss the conditions for holding

interest and attention which are given in this chapter.

2. Show by an example from your own experience how the direction in which attention naturally tends depends upon the ideas, habits, and the instincts which one already has.

3. In what ways do children differ from adults in their ability to pay attention?

4. Give examples from your own experience of children's inability to attend to more than one thing at a time.

5. What things must you bear in mind concerning children's power to pay attention, when preparing a Sunday school lesson to teach to your class?

FOR FURTHER READING

The books listed in connection with Chapter XVI belong here as well. Add to them the excellent discussion of differences between children and adults, to be found in chapters 6 and 10 of NORSWORTHY and WHITLEY'S "Psychology of Childhood."

CHAPTER XIX

ILLUSTRATING THE LESSON

THERE are three ways of illustrating a lesson: (1) By appealing to the pupil's eyes as well as to his ears; (2) by presenting cases which exemplify the rule or principle which is to be taught; (3) by using analogies which interpret the new lesson in terms of some older, more familiar bit of knowledge which is more or less like it.

"Seeing is believing," runs the old maxim. Yes, and seeing is understanding and remembering too. The teacher is foolish who relies upon words merely when he might supplement his verbal descriptions and explanations with objects, models, pictures, diagrams, and maps. These enable the pupil to see as well as to hear; they engage his interest and hold his attention; he understands more quickly and more clearly; and he remembers longer and more accurately.

In his excellent little book on "Experimental Psychology in Relation to Education," Prof. C. W. Valentine, of Queen's University, Belfast, describes a simple experiment on the value of the map, which may easily be tried anywhere. He has written two narratives of about one hundred and sixty words each, purporting to describe historical events. One

tells about the suppression of a revolt among the native subjects of King William X, of Zamboo Land, A.D. 2100; the other is an account of the discovery of Feddah Land, in the reign of Peter VI, A.D. 1560. All of the places, characters, and incidents are purely imaginary; and the narratives present to any one who hears them for the first time a body of material as unfamiliar as real history is to a child. The two accounts contain the same number of items and are of equal difficulty. The first is accompanied by a roughly drawn map; the second has none. The experimenter reads the first to a group of people, illustrating it by pointing out on the map each place and name mentioned. He then covers the map and asks each member of the group to write down the answers to a list of thirteen questions, each of which may be answered by a single word or phrase, covering one item of the narrative just read. After this has been done, he reads the second narrative, devoting to it the same amount of time as to the first, but without referring to a map; then he has the members of the group answer a list of thirteen questions concerning its items. The number of correct answers in each list is then counted and the results compared.

Now and then a person will be found who remembers the items of the second narrative better than those of the first. But such persons are very few; and they usually give as reason the fact that their experience in answering the first list of questions gave them a hint as to what sort of items they should make a special effort to remember in prepa-

ration for answering the second list. The general result invariably is that the facts that were presented to both ear and eye are better remembered than those that were presented to the ear alone. The total number of correct answers given by all the members of the group to the questions concerning the narrative with a map is from twenty-five to thirty-five per cent higher than the total number of correct answers to the questions concerning the other narrative. If the order of procedure be varied, so that the purely auditory presentation is made first and the presentation with a map second, the difference in favor of the map will be even greater.

An experiment of this sort may be tried by any group, whether it has access to the book quoted or not. Let the leader of the group simply devise his own narratives for this purpose, being careful to make them of equal length, not more than 175 words, and to see to it that each contains at least thirteen definite items, such as names, dates, and circumstantial details, which may be remembered and inquired about. Be sure to make the narratives of equal difficulty and ask an equal number of questions. The experience of being thus put in the place of the children whom they teach, by having their memory for unfamiliar material tested, is helpful to teachers. It puts them in the attitude of the learner once more and helps them to appreciate how a child is helped by a map, diagram, or picture.

In the second of the three senses of the term illustrations are of essential, even indispensable, value. No general truth can be adequately taught without

presenting to the pupil some, at least, of the particular facts and experiences which justify that general statement. Without some knowledge of the cases which come under a general law, instances of its operation, examples of its truth, the pupil has no basis for understanding it. In this sense illustrations lie at the basis of all inductive reasoning. If the children in a public school, for example, are to learn the principle that vapor condenses with the fall of temperature, the teacher will help them to arrive at the principle by a consideration of particular cases of its application which have come, or can be brought, under their observation—"seeing your breath" on a cold day, the frosting of a window pane, the cloud of steam from a boiling kettle, the fall of rain or snow upon the mountains and not in the valleys.

We think so often of the comparisons that Jesus used when he said, "It is like," that we may forget how constantly he used illustrations of this more direct type, actual cases of the application of his principles, and examples of their working. He illustrated his injunction not to resist one that is evil by adding examples of how to act if struck by such a one on the right cheek, or if robbed by him of a coat through a piece of legal chicanery, or if compelled to go with him a mile. He gave the general rule, "Do not your righteousness before men to be seen of them," and forthwith illustrated it by the application to the particular instances of almsgiving, praying, and fasting. He enforced his teaching concerning God's providing care by citing the ravens,

sparrows, the lilies of the field, the grass "which to-day is, and to-morrow is cast into the oven."

When the truth to be taught is such that it cannot well be presented to the pupil's vision, and when particular cases which exemplify it are not readily accessible or are hard for the pupil to understand, the teacher must have recourse to the third type of illustrations—analogies, comparisons, stories, or figures of speech which interpret the new truth in terms of its likeness to some other more familiar facts or experiences. Most of Jesus's parables are illustrations of this sort.

There are pitfalls in the path of the inexperienced teacher who undertakes to use illustrations of this third type. The temptation is to use them too readily, without first seeking illustrations that are more exact. An analogy is always more or less loose; the likeness holds in certain respects only, and no one expects it to hold in all respects. If the degree of unlikeness associated with the likeness is so great as to involve a risk of misleading, one may always offset it by another analogy. Illustrations of this kind are, therefore, the easy recourse of a teacher whose own knowledge is inexact and precarious. He cannot map out, diagram, picture, or model what he does not know precisely, and he is not sufficiently sure of his ground to set forth any particular cases or instances which exemplify the truth which he propounds; so he expresses his hazy ideas by telling in a number of ways what that truth is like. This is not to condemn analogical illustrations. There are some truths that can hardly be taught in any

other way; and one of the supreme tests of a good teacher is his ability to make apt and effective use of the principle of analogy. But the point is that many a poor teacher is content with analogies who ought to push on to larger knowledge which would enable him to use more exact illustrations.

If the teacher uses analogies, he should be sure that they really illustrate and illumine the lesson and that they help the pupil both to attend to and to understand the point that is to be taught. The illustration should be more familiar than the truth it is meant to convey. It should lie within the experience of the pupils and be suited to their comprehension. Its elements of likeness to the truth should outweigh its elements of unlikeness. It should not be so suggestive as to attract attention to itself rather than to shed light upon the lesson.

For example, to compare the work of the Holy Spirit through the means of grace to the distribution of gas from a central tank by means of a system of pipes is to use an illustration too incongruous to be helpful. It is quite as bad to extend Paul's figure of the one body of which we are all members and to tell little children that they are that body's finger nails; yet that has been done. Even the beautiful and appropriate simile of the Good Shepherd may not be understood by the children who are too young or of too wholly urban an experience. "I'm not a sheep. I ain't got no wool," is the recorded reaction of a cockney youngster.

If objects are used in illustration, one must be particularly careful to abide by the rules just given. In-

deed, one is safer never to use objects whose relation to the truth is merely analogical or figurative. The physical presence of the object is apt to make the illustration itself so stand out that the point to be illustrated is neither attended to nor remembered.

FOR INVESTIGATION AND DISCUSSION

1. If possible, try on a group of persons the experiment on the value of a map, which is described in this chapter.
2. Give examples of lessons illustrated by each of the three kinds of illustrations here described.
3. Discuss the value of maps and pictures; and principles for the use of the blackboard.
4. Give further examples of Jesus' use of the method of illustration by citing cases which exemplify the principle he sought to teach.
5. What are some of the pitfalls of analogical illustrations?
6. Discuss the advantages and disadvantages, the values and dangers, of object teaching.

FOR FURTHER READING

VALENTINE's book is named in the text. Books on Jesus' methods of teaching have been listed in connection with Chapter XV. Besides DUBOIS' "The Point of Contact in Teaching" read J. ADAMS: "Exposition and Illustration in Teaching"; W. L. HERVEY: "Picture Work." The examples of poor analogies cited in the text have been taken from the excellent discussion of this subject in PENSTONE: "The Teacher's Craft."

CHAPTER XX

THE DRAMATIC METHOD OF TEACHING

CHILDREN at play are naturally dramatic. They are seldom content just to see or hear or read about things and events; their impulse is to act these out. "Let's play horse"; "Let's play school"; "Let's play Indian"; "Ding dong, all aboard, toot, toot!"—these and their like are familiar phrases to any one who knows children.

"There is nothing," says Kirkpatrick, "from the noises and movements of a locomotive to the silent art of Jack Frost, or from making a pie to constructing a church, from burglary to a fashionable tea party, that the child cannot imitate by the use of make-believe objects and symbolic movements. The essentials of every process and action in the heavens above and the earth beneath, of which the child sees or hears, are made familiar to him in his dramatic imitations." Our neighborhood was overrun with "armies" while America was at war. One day in late April of 1919 I stumbled on something new. The children, who had been playing on the lawn a few minutes before, had disappeared. In answer to my call, the head of a seven-year-old was poked out of the window of an empty garage next door. "Please, daddy, mayn't we stay out a little

longer? We want to attend the peace conference Oscar is holding in here."

The dramatic impulse manifests itself early. Most children begin at about two years of age to make such announcements as "I'm a kitty," "I'm a doggie," "I'm a moo cow," and to act out the part as best they can, expecting others, too, to enter into their play. It persists indefinitely; grown-ups who have no make-believe left in them are to be pitied. It is strongest throughout childhood, of course, up to the teens; and it is at its climax from four to seven. In these years the child's dramatic play fills so large a part of his life that it is hard sometimes to draw the line between what is real to him and what he knows to be make-believe. I found a five-year-old a few days ago returning home from kindergarten by a circuitous and inconvenient route, across lots and through fences. "Why don't you go home by the sidewalk?" I asked. "But, you see, there is an army against me there."

Teachers in the public schools have lately begun to understand what an effective educational instrument the natural impulse of children to dramatic play may be, if afforded proper material and opportunity for expression. Children are far more interested, as a rule, in acting out a story that has been told them than in merely retelling it or writing it or illustrating it by drawing. And they get more out of the story which they reproduce in this dramatic way. It becomes more real to them, and they understand it better, because they have lived it over

again from the inside, so to speak, and have in a measure entered into and shared the motives and experiences of the persons whose characters they have assumed. In the teaching of oral reading, composition, literature, history, and geography, dramatic methods are most directly usable and have proved especially successful. A suggestive account of how one school utilized this impulse in practically the whole of its work is given in Harriet Finlay-Johnson's book on "The Dramatic Method of Teaching."

Fortunately, we now have an even more concrete and convincing account of the use of dramatic methods in the religious education of children. For five years past, at the Hyde Park Church of Disciples in Chicago, Miss Elizabeth E. Miller has conducted a dramatic club of children from six to fourteen years of age, who meet for one hour each Sunday afternoon to dramatize and act out stories from the Bible. In her book, entitled "The Dramatization of Bible Stories," Miss Miller presents a record of her work with these children, with a detailed description of her methods, and the text of their dramatizations of the stories of Joseph, David and Goliath, Moses in the Bulrushes, Ruth, Esther, Abraham and the Three Guests, Daniel in the Lions' Den, the Wise and Foolish Virgins, the Great Supper, the Good Samaritan, and the Prodigal Son, besides suggestive analyses of a number of other stories. The book is clear, straightforward, and practical. Both Miss Miller's work and her account

constitute a most important contribution to educational method.

The fundamental point which one must keep clear is that such dramatic work is for sake of the education of the children who take part in it, not for sake of the play itself as a finished artistic product or for the enjoyment of parents or other spectators who may from time to time be invited to witness its performance. Most of the work, indeed, is done without reference to possible public performance. It is play in the true sense—the naturally dramatic play of children—organized, supervised, and guided by an educative purpose, yet remaining play.

The children do more, then, than simply memorize and stage a dialogue which is furnished to them ready-made. There is little that is educative about amateur theatricals of the common sort. The essence of the dramatic method of teaching, on the contrary, lies in the fact that the children make the play themselves. They are the authors, as well as the actors, of the little drama. The number and form of the acts and scenes, the words of the dialogue, and the character of the accompanying action, take shape slowly as a result of the coöperative effort of the children themselves, as one after another, in spontaneous play, offers his own interpretation of this or that part, subject to the criticism of the group as a whole.

The first step, of course, is for the teacher to tell the story simply, directly, with dramatic unity and movement, emphasizing essentials, using direct

discourse, and aiming to develop within the children vivid mental pictures of its outstanding events.[1]

The next step is to talk the story over with the children, and to have them determine the general plan which they will follow in playing it, by dividing it into the most important pictures or scenes.

Then comes the playing. After a brief discussion of what should take place in the first scene, some of the children are asked to act it out, which they do, using their own words and following their own ideas as to appropriate details of action. The teacher then, to quote Miss Miller, "raises such questions as 'Which parts did these children do best?' 'Why?' 'Where can they improve it?' 'What would you do to make the part better?' 'What do you think should have been said here?' This leads to constructive criticism of the scene by the children themselves rather than by the leader in charge. Each child is eager to offer suggestions at this point and is anxious for an opportunity to give his own interpretation of the part by acting it out." The scene is acted again, with different children for some or all parts, whose interpretation is in turn subjected to the criticism of the group.

Each scene is worked out in a similar way, and the story as a whole is played through many times. The teacher sees to it that every child has a chance

[1] Teachers who wish help on this point can do no better than to follow the counsels of Sara Cone Bryant's book on "How to Tell Stories to Children." This contains a brief description, too, of the schoolroom dramatization of stories. A collection of stories, adapted for telling with this end in view, which may serve as examples of such adaptation, is to be found in Ada R. Skinner's "Dramatic Stories to Read and Tell."

to try out many parts and become familiar with all. There is continual discussion, reworking, and change, until the play has been reduced to the essential scenes and the children recognize it to be the result of their best effort.

Usually the process stops at this point. The story has been mastered, and the children are ready to take up another. Sometimes, however, it will seem best to go further; to give to the play a finished form and to offer a final presentation to which parents or friends may be invited. In this case the children will work out the wording carefully, using the biblical language so far as possible. And they will choose those who are to take part in the final presentation, on the basis of their success in the several characters.

The high educative value of such a method of teaching to children the great stories of the Bible is obvious. At the end the children possess the story in so vital a way that they will never forget it. They have in imagination lived through its events and shared its experiences; and their conception of these has been corrected and deepened by repeated group criticism and discussion. Incidentally, such coöperation as the method involves is excellent social training; the children are developed in power of expression, and they are given a motive for the memorization of some of the great passages of the Bible.

Stage settings, properties, and costumes should be of the simplest character. This is imaginative play, and its spirit is best conserved if much be left to the imagination. Such properties and costumes as

are used should not be reserved for a final performance, but used at each practice. We must not forget that the real work of education is done, not at the final performance, but in the repeated playing the story, with the attendant discussions. Such properties and costumes, moreover, should be made by the children themselves. All the educative values of constructive hand-work may thus be added to those of the dramatic method of teaching.

FOR INVESTIGATION AND DISCUSSION

1. Describe the development of dramatic play in children.
2. Describe the use of dramatic play as an educational method in the schools.
3. Make clear the difference between the use of dramatization as an educational method and the staging of a play for public performance.
4. What are some of the possible dangers and necessary limitations of the dramatic method of teaching in the Sunday school?
5. What principles should be followed in the preparation of stories to tell to children, with a view to their serving as a basis for dramatization?

FOR FURTHER READING

The best books have been named in the text.

CHAPTER XXI

THE PURPOSES OF QUESTIONING

ONE of the outstanding differences, in present practice, between the public school and the Sunday school is that most public school teachers ask too many questions and most Sunday school teachers do not ask questions enough. For the first half of this statement there is ample evidence in the careful study by Miss Romiett Stevens on "The Question as a Measure of Efficiency in Instruction." Miss Stevens secured complete stenographic reports of twenty high school lessons in English, history, science, Latin, modern languages, and mathematics; she observed one hundred more such lessons chosen at random, with a view to counting and noting the number and nature of the questions asked in each; and she followed each of ten classes through an entire day's work for the purpose of studying the aggregate question-stimulus to which each was subjected in the course of the day.

The results of her study are surprising. In only eight of the twenty lessons completely reported the teacher asked less than ninety questions in the period of forty-five minutes, the average being sixty-eight. In each of the remaining twelve lessons more than ninety questions were asked in the same period of

time, the average being 128. A freshman class in high school, in a day's work of five periods of forty minutes each, not counting gymnasium, was subjected to 516 questions and expected to return 516 answers, which is at the rate of 2.58 questions and 2.58 answers per minute. The lowest number of questions recorded in a day's work for a class was 321, and the average number 395.

Such rapid-fire questioning, Miss Stevens rightly holds, defeats its own ends. It maintains a nervous tension in the classroom that must in the long run be injurious. More than that, it is a symptom of the fact that the real work of the hour is being done by the teacher, and that the pupil's share is reduced simply to brief, punctuation-like answers to the teacher's questions. Such questions appeal to mere memory or to superficial judgment rather than to real thought; they cultivate in the pupil neither independent judgment nor the power of expression; they ignore individual needs and discourage initiative; they make out of the classroom a place to display knowledge, rather than a laboratory in which to acquire it.

The second half of the proposition, that most Sunday school teachers do not ask questions enough, has not been established by any such investigation as that of Miss Stevens. A similar study, on the basis of complete stenographic reports, of typical Sunday school lessons, would be a most valuable addition to our resources in the field of religious pedagogy. Till such a study is made, one must simply record his conviction that Sunday school teachers, as a gen-

eral rule, ask too few, rather than too many, questions. This conviction is based upon general observation and upon the frequency of such remarks as: "I just can't get my class to study," "There are only two or three who ever answer my questions," "My pupils don't know anything about the Bible," "As long as I do all the talking, things go all right," etc.

Both the overquestioning of the public-school teacher and the underquestioning of the Sunday school teacher have a common root in a misconception of the function of the recitation. The mistake is to sunder study from recitation too sharply; to assume that the pupil's real growth in knowledge should take place away from the classroom and that the function of the recitation is simply to test whether or not he did the study assigned. Under the influence of this idea, and backed by the power to compel study which the sanction of the public school system affords, the teacher in these schools adopts the quick, high-pressure method of questioning which seeks to catch the pupil napping and to explore to the last detail his mastery of the textbook. The Sunday school teacher, under the influence of the same idea, but discouraged by his lack of power to compel study, is prone to give up the recitation method, to quit asking questions that presuppose study on the part of the pupil, and to adopt a so-called discussion method which all too often results in his doing all of the talking, as well as all of the work.

Leaders in public education, however, have come

to see how mistaken is this conception of the function of the recitation. It is absurd, when one stops to think of it, to expect the real work of education to be done while the pupil is separated from the teacher, in study that is undirected and unsupervised, and to give over the precious moments when teacher and pupil are together to a merely mechanical testing of the results of that study.

Study and recitation should be parts, rather, of one organic whole. The teacher should be a present leader and helper, rather than a taskmaster who periodically returns to demand the tale of bricks wrought without straw in his absence. It is his function to inspire, direct, and guide the pupil's work. Education is a coöperative undertaking. It is a quest for knowledge and power, in which the teacher leads the way, and in which he enlists the interest and effort of his pupils.

In our best public schools, therefore, a movement is growing toward *supervised study*. The term means that the emphasis in teaching is shifted from merely hearing a lesson to directing the pupil's study of the lesson. That shift of emphasis involves many changes. The teacher becomes a director of study, working with the pupil, rather than for him. The class period is lengthened—in many schools doubled, with a brief intermission—and at least one-half of the time is devoted to study under the direction of the teacher, the other half being divided between assignment and recitation. The assignment of the lesson assumes a place of fundamental importance. Pupils are shown how to study, are given specific

questions or problems in connection with each unit of recitation, and are supervised as they undertake to apply the principles of correct studying to these problems. They are afforded a degree of individual attention not possible under the old system of mass recitation; and those who go at a new lesson wrongly are checked and guided aright. Undirected study at home is eliminated or reduced to a minimum; and high-pressure methods of recitation are done away with.

Schools will differ, of course, in the degree to which they will undertake to supervise the study of their pupils, and in the extent to which they will reorganize their teaching methods and schedules to this end. But the principle of supervised study is sound and true. And in its light we are prepared to understand the purposes of questioning in the teaching process. When teacher and pupil are *working together* with a definite end in view, it is natural that each should ask questions of the other.

The teacher's purposes in asking questions of the pupil are of three chief sorts:

1. That he may learn the pupil's present situation, problem, or predicament. If the teacher is to help a pupil to gain further knowledge or skill, he must understand what the pupil now knows, has done and feels able to do, what difficulties he faces, and how he proposes to get to work. The teacher will learn this in part by frankly questioning his pupil, not so much by way of formal test, as because both recognize that the teacher must know these things if he is to be of any real help to the pupil.

2. That he may inspire and direct the pupil's activity. It is by questions that the teacher wakes the pupil to realize what he does not as yet know, and stirs him to want further knowledge and skill; faces him with problems, rouses him to think for himself, and directs his awakened mind into profitable channels of study and action; leads him to compare, analyze, discriminate, and associate facts, to draw inferences and make generalizations. This is by far the most fundamental purpose of questioning. Directed to such ends, the question is the most effective of all educational instruments. Yet how often we find questions of this type set apart as "thought-questions" from what are denominated "fact-questions," with the implication that they are of an especially rare and difficult sort. The truth is that comparatively few of the questions of a skillful teacher deal with mere facts. He lays all emphasis upon questions of the thought-provoking and thought-directing sort, which appeal to judgment and reasoning power rather than to mere memory, awaken interest and initiative and set pupils to work. The more important of these questions he prepares carefully beforehand; they constitute the very center and substance of his lesson plan.

3. That he may detain the pupil's mind upon certain things which must be learned by repetition in attention, or which must be approached from many angles to be fully understood. Some matters, both of knowledge and of skill, must be drilled upon. And in the drill of the schoolroom, unlike that of

the parade-ground, questions are more effective than commands.

The pupil's purpose in asking questions of the teacher is to gain direction and help. The wise teacher welcomes these questions as indications of the pupil's awakened initiative and coöperation. He can have no better assurance of the success of his teaching than to have his pupils ask many questions, provided these be worth the asking.

More and better questions should be asked in our Sunday school classes. Some Sunday school teachers fail at this point, be it granted, because they do not know enough about the lesson to ask any other than the most obvious fact-questions. But more fail because of the uncertainty caused by their holding fast to the old idea that all questioning must be of the recitation type, which presupposes and tests the results of previous study at home, while they are at the same time unable to secure such study in any consistent way. Such teachers might well try out the "Supervised Study" plan. Whether or not they would permanently reorganize their class work upon this basis, it would mean much if they would learn to ask questions of the type which this plan enjoins.

FOR INVESTIGATION AND DISCUSSION

1. Discuss the limitations and possible bad results of such over-questioning as Miss Stevens describes.

2. Observe a few typical Sunday school classes, noting down carefully the number and character of the questions asked and the answers returned.

3. Show how the principle of supervised study revises our ideas concerning class-room methods of teaching.

4. Show how this principle makes questioning a natural element in the cooperation of teacher and pupil. What, in light of this principle, are the teacher's purposes in asking questions? What are the pupil's purposes?

5. Discuss the principles which underlie effective questioning.

FOR FURTHER READING

ROMIETT STEVENS: "The Question as a Measure of Efficiency in Instruction"; J. G. FITCH: "The Art of Questioning"; G. H. BETTS: "The Recitation"; H. H. HORNE: "Story-telling, Questioning, and Studying"; F. M. McMURRY: "How to Study and Teaching How to Study"; A. L. HALL-QUEST: "Supervised Study."

CHAPTER XXII

WHY EXAMINATIONS?

"WELL, professor, I beat you to it," exclaimed a college sophomore as he handed in his paper at the close of a term examination. "What do you mean?" asked the teacher. "You asked just the questions that I expected and prepared for," was the answer. "I out-guessed you this time." "No, you did not," returned the professor, "for I was not trying to out-guess you. If your judgment as to the proper content of this examination coincided with mine, I am very happy. It is good evidence that we succeeded this term, I in teaching and you in getting the main points of the course."

An examination ought not to be a battle of wits, with the teacher trying to trip his pupils or catch them lacking some detail of knowledge, while they, on the other hand, seek to elude or outwit him. It ought rather to be the climax of the course, the natural conclusion to which the teaching of the previous weeks looked forward.

1. The chief reason for giving an examination at the close of a course of lessons upon any subject that constitutes a unit of instruction, is to impel the pupil to go back over the material that he has studied day by day, to view its various parts in light of

the whole, to sum it all up in right relation and to organize it into a coherent system of ideas that will be permanent and usable. It is a mistake, therefore, to excuse from the final examination all the better students, as some schools and colleges do. It is just these better students who should have the examinations, because they can profit most from it. It matters little, perhaps, whether pupils of mediocre ability ever attempt to gather up the impressions gained in the course; but it is important that those who are competent should press on to that final, systematic comprehension of its material to which the examination impels them.

2. Incidentally, the examination is a test of the pupil's mastery of the course and of the ability therewith developed in him. It must be a fair test, moreover, if it is to fulfill its primary function as a motive to final review and organization.

This means that the questions should appeal to the pupil's understanding rather than to mere memory, and that they should deal with important aspects of the material covered. The examination itself must exhibit that perspective which is the goal of the work of the course. In this sense it is true that the better pupils will always be able, in some measure, to anticipate the matters concerning which questions will be asked in examination. Good examination questions deal with aspects of the course that are fairly obvious, because big, outstanding and important.

This is not to say, however, that the questions themselves should be so big as to be vague and in-

definite or to lend themselves to interminable answers. "I could have written all day on the first question," was the complaint of a conscientious student after a certain examination. Examination questions should be clear, definite and capable of reasonably complete answer within the time allotted. They should deal with big things, but in a precise enough way. Often an examination question may best reach its end by indirection. It will relate to some particular situation or application of the truth, and will be capable of a brief, direct answer; but that answer will reveal whether or not the pupil has mastered the larger truth and gained the broader perspective which the question presupposes.

The examination is not the sole test of the pupil's mastery of the course or of the ability that he has developed in connection with it. Some pupils are constitutionally unable to pull themselves together and to do their best in examination. Aside from this fact, experience has brought teachers more and more to feel that the whole of a pupil's work should be given full weight and value in the attempt to measure his attainment, and that promotion should be based not simply upon the final examination, but also upon his daily record for attendance, recitation and laboratory work, and upon the character of his notebook, themes, constructions, or other products of his activity in connection with the course.

3. It should be noted, however, that this daily record is apt to be better if the pupil knows that at the end is to come the test of an examination. This is the third function of examinations. They serve

as a stimulus to more faithful and thorough work throughout the term. Many colleges and secondary schools have at some time or other had to meet a petition from the members of the senior class to be excused from final examinations for the last term of their course, provided they made a passing grade in their daily work, on the plea that they were so occupied at that time with preparation for the activities of commencement week. Most faculties who have granted this petition have been sorry, for it has generally resulted in spoiling the work of the last term of senior year. Emancipated from the thought of a final reckoning in these courses, the seniors have "loafed on the job," and even good students have been content to do little more than a passing grade of work.

4. Examinations constitute, finally, a test of the teacher. When a pupil fails, it means that, in this case, the teacher has failed as well. And a teacher who finds that any considerable proportion of his pupils are unable to pass creditably a fair examination may well question whether his own work is up to the standard. A careful study of their failures will often reveal to him the weaknesses of his own teaching. He may find it helpful to submit both his list of examination questions and his pupils' papers to his principal or to some other teacher, for criticism and suggestion.

All of these reasons for giving examinations apply to the work of the Sunday school, as well as to that of public school and college. It may be granted that the examination tests and stimulates only the in-

tellectual side of the pupil's work, and that intellectual attainment is not the whole, or even the primary, aim of the Sunday school teacher. But it is just upon this intellectual side that many Sunday schools are wofully lacking; and a system of examinations, properly conceived and administered, may do much to lift the work of such schools to a higher level.

There are reasons, indeed, why the Sunday school has even greater need of a system of examinations than the public school. The latter has ways of enforcing more thorough work from day to day which are not open to the Sunday school. Moreover, it has more time at its disposal, its curriculum is better standardized, its teachers better trained, and its methods have been more thoroughly worked out through long experience. Besides all this, there is a practical urgency about the education which the public school offers, both in knowledge and skill, which most pupils are slow to feel in connection with the spiritual truths of religion. For all of these reasons it is conceivable that the public school might, more easily than the Sunday school, dispense with examinations, yet maintain a high standard of work.

It is for the sake of their educational value that the Sunday school should institute a system of examinations, not as a bit of machinery upon which to base the promotion of pupils. We have seen that the better public schools do not base the pupil's promotion solely upon his ability to pass an examination. And one may question whether the Sunday school, in view of the differences between itself and

the public school, ought to base promotion upon examinations at all. It is of far more consequence that the Sunday school hold its pupils than that it "flunk" out those who do not take or pass its examinations; and it is best that all of its pupils should advance to higher grades of work, year after year, as they are promoted in the public schools and acquire new interests and capabilities.

The examinations, therefore, should be optional. Pupils need not take them if unwilling to do so; but all should be encouraged to take them, and every effort should be expended to build up within the school a body of public opinion that will sustain them and enlist the interest and coöperation of the pupils. This is not so impossible as it may seem at first thought. British and Canadian universities have long drawn a distinction between those students who are content merely to "pass" in their work and those who go in for "honors." Many of the better American schools and colleges are adopting like plans with excellent success. Something of this sort may well be done by the Sunday school. Those of its pupils who pass creditable examinations may be promoted with honor, as distinguished from those who merely go on to the next year's work.

Concrete suggestions as to methods of conducting such examinations may be found in the unit on "The Teacher" in the newer teacher-training courses of the several denominations. It may be added here simply that the questions of the examination, however conducted, should appeal to understanding and judgment rather than to mere memory; that pupils

may well be permitted to take questions home with them for answer, if that seems wise, and be put upon their honor to do their own work without asking help from other persons; and that it is more important to get them to do the work which the examination requires than to test whether or not they carry under their hats, stored in memory, all the detailed facts with which the course has dealt.

Most schools, which plan to institute a system of examinations, would do well to appoint a well-qualified examining board, or a supervisor of examinations, to plan carefully, in counsel with the teachers, the methods suited to the different grades, and to see to it that the examinations are administered in such a way as to be of the highest educational value.

FOR INVESTIGATION AND DISCUSSION

1. Discuss the reasons set forth in this chapter for giving examinations. Could these ends be better attained in some other way? If so, in what way?

2. Why has the Sunday school even more need of a system of examinations than the public school?

3. What ought to be the relation of the examination to promotion, in the several grades?

4. Describe some practical methods of giving examinations in the Sunday school.

5. Why is it best to have an examining board or a director of religious education charged with the duty of supervising examinations, instead of leaving the matter entirely to the several teachers?

FOR FURTHER READING

W. C. BAGLEY, in "The Educative Process"; G. D. STRAYER, in "The Teaching Process"; and H. H. HORNE, in "Story-telling, Questioning and Studying," present the theory of examinations in the public schools. An article in the "Encyclopædia of Sunday Schools and Religious Education" deals with examinations in the Sunday school. There is a good brief discussion in BURTON and MATHEWS' "Principles and Ideals for the Sunday School."

CHAPTER XXIII

APPLYING THE LESSON

LESSONS are of three sorts, depending upon the aim in view: (1) *Practice or drill lessons,* which seek to establish a habit, as of skill or of memory; (2) *Thinking or problem lessons,* which lead pupils to observe facts, discriminate elements, seek causes, apprehend relations, draw conclusions, verify hypotheses, and do whatever else may be needful in order that they may arrive at adequate ideas and true convictions in any given field of knowledge; (3) *Lessons in appreciation,* which undertake so to present to pupils the ideal aspects of nature and human life, literature and art as to lead them not simply to know, but to feel and appreciate the things of real worth.

No lesson is complete until the pupil can apply it. Drill has not been adequate until the pupil can use, readily and efficiently, the habit of skill it is meant to impart. No principle, formula, idea or other bit of knowledge is fully grasped until the pupil can see its bearing upon new situations, other than those from which he acquired it, and is able to use it in the solution of new problems. No great human deed, no piece of literature or of art is really appreciated that does not make the pupil eager to ex-

perience it or its like again. In all of these fields, then, the lesson is applied when the pupil is able, because of what he has learned in it, to bring added power to bear upon new situations.

At Lake Chautauqua, on one Sunday of last summer, the sermon to the children was on "The Bramble-bush King," drawn from Jotham's parable (Judges 9:7-15) of the bramble that was chosen king by the trees, and forthwith commanded that every tree should be burned that was not little enough to crawl under its shade. Ways were pointed out in which boys and girls, as well as older folk, may be like the little, envious, prickly bramble, when they insist upon having their own way, want to lord it over others, cannot stand it to have anybody around that is bigger or brighter or more popular than they, and so on.

That afternoon, while the rest of the family took an after-dinner siesta, a seven-year-old boy, of his own initiative and without help, wrote what follows. It is reproduced just as he wrote it, though capitals and punctuation are uncertain, and the spelling is here and there oddly phonetic, for he had just completed his first year at school.

"One time long long ago all of the trees said we must have a king to rool over us. First thay asked the olivetree if she wood be king and rule over us but the olive-tree said shood I stop makeing olives for pepul to eat, and just stand around doing nothing, no i shall not be king. Next thay asked the paretree if he wood be king, but the pare tree said shood I stop makeing pares for children to eat. no i shall

not be king. Next thay went to the plum-tree and said will you be king. the plum-tree said shood i stop makeing plums for children to eat. no i shall not be king. next thay went to the hegg will you be king and the hegg said yes i will be king if you promise to do just as i tell you. we promis to do just as you say said all the trees together all right i shall be king then. the first command was that every tree shood come under my shade. and just think of the statele elm and maypel tree and all the other big trees and the hegg said if they cood not he wood burn tham with fire."

This boy was applying the sermon of the morning. His reproduction of the story involved, in some degree, all three of the types of application defined above.

Most obviously, his attitude was one of appreciation. He had enjoyed the story so much that he wanted to keep it, so set it down on paper. This same boy, some months before, had been deeply moved by his mother's reading of Ernest Seton's "Biography of a Grizzly," which a neighbor lad had loaned him. On the day after the reading was finished he stayed at his desk, busily occupied in writing. When his mother was impelled by the unusual quiet to inquire what he was doing, he showed her a bundle of sheets upon which he had begun to transcribe the book. "Daddy said he couldn't buy it for me now," he explained, "and I want it so badly that I am just going to copy it all."

The form that his appreciation took in both these cases, again, was determined by his ability to ap-

ply a set of habits acquired in public school, where he was learning to read and write. This is the boy who, a few months after entering public school, asked to be excused from going to Sunday school on the ground that "you don't learn anything there." Perhaps if the Sunday school had been wise enough to give him an opportunity to apply to its material the new habits and skills which he was acquiring in the public school, his parents would not have had to face that problem. It is unfortunate that many Sunday schools yet feel that they can handle the pupils of the Primary Department all together, putting six-, seven- and eight-year-old children into the same group and teaching them by the same methods. Nowhere does one year make a greater difference than between the six-year-old child, who is just entering school and cannot yet read or write, and the seven-year-old, who has had a year's experience in school and has acquired these abilities. In no department is it more important that the children be divided into carefully graded groups, and taught in ways that keep pace with their growing knowledge and enlist their newly-acquired skills.

The boy's written story shows, finally, that he had begun to apply and assimilate the ideas of the parable in terms of his own experience. The differences between Jotham's story, which had been followed in the sermon of the morning, and the boy's reproduction of it, are significant. The vine and the fig tree have dropped out of his mind, and are replaced by the pear and plum trees, about which he knows more. These, moreover, give as their rea-

sons for declining the doubtful honor, the fact that they are busy making pears and plums for children to eat. The bramble of the original story has become a "hegg" (hedge), which is natural enough when one considers that the lawn of this boy's home is fenced by a barberry hedge. The olive tree remains, for olives are dainties which he highly prizes; but the cedars of Lebanon, which were the special objects of the bramble's envy, have changed into "the statele elm and maypel tree."

But what about the practical application of the story? To write is well; but to do is better. Will this boy apply to his own character and conduct the parable of the bramble? Has he acquired added power of moral judgment and self-control? Unless that application be made, Jotham's story will remain a mere tale, and the preacher of the morning will have failed.

These are difficult questions to answer. It was Robert Louis Stevenson, I think, who said that the hardest thing about the work of the teacher was that you had to keep on chopping and chopping, and you never saw any chips fly. Our work is inward and at long range, and its full results are never immediately obvious.

It is interesting that the boy's version draws no moral, though the preacher had presented some direct practical applications. But we may not conclude that the boy had failed to get these, or that he could make none of his own. He simply tells his story in good climactic fashion, then stops. He reveals the fine sense for a good story, which is

natural to children, and something of the unconscious art of a good story-teller.

This boy has gained a principle in light of which he may face his own problems. His evident appreciation of the story, its clear grip upon his imagination, his reworking and restating it in terms of his established habits and experiences, augur well for his permanent possession of the idea it embodies. But he must go further if it is to be of full value to his life. He must practice the application of this principle to his own conduct.

In such practice of the principles of life the Sunday school teacher may lead and guide his pupils. The demand is justly made of the Sunday school in these days that it maintain a higher level of intellectual efficiency in its teaching. But with that there is a demand for greater practical efficiency as well.

We may strive for this in two chief directions:

1. By a more definite correlation of effort with the parents of our pupils. It meant a good deal that the mother of the boy quoted should have been able to report to the preacher that she had helped her son in a selfish moment by reminding him of the bramble. One of the losses sustained in passing from Uniform to Graded Lessons is at this point of contact with parents. Graded Sunday schools must develop plans whereby the intelligent and sympathetic coöperation of teachers and parents may be secured and maintained. Parents' classes, weekly letters to parents, short courses for parents covering in a few weeks the material to be studied by

their children throughout the year and departmental parent-teachers' associations are among the possibilities.

2. By making the Sunday school itself a center of Christian activity as well as of Christian instruction. It is wasteful for the school of a church to confine its contact with its pupils to one hour on Sunday which is given over wholly to instruction, and to leave the leadership of the active, social life of these same pupils to other organizations which are sympathetic, indeed, with its purposes, but whose plans are independent and uncorrelated.

My next-door neighbor is a minister, whose church has the laudable custom of presenting Bibles, on Children's Day, to those of its children who have reached the age of seven and have learned to read. He marks a verse for each child, as a personal message. For one boy this year he marked the exhortation in 1 Timothy, "Exercise thyself unto godliness: for bodily exercise is profitable for a little; but godliness is profitable for all things, having promise of the life which now is, and of that which is to come." He received the following note from this boy:

"DEAR DR. M——: I have found the verse you marked in my Bible, 1 Timothy 4:7, 8. I am learning by practicing how to play ball and how to ride a horse, and last summer I learned to swim and row. I will try to practice to be good, as the verse says.

Lovingly, JOE."

FOR INVESTIGATION AND DISCUSSION

1. What are some of the differences between the three types of lessons referred to at the beginning of this chapter?

2. Does the Sunday school use lessons of all three types? Give examples.

3. Describe ways in which the Sunday school may seek better correlation of effort with the parents of its pupils.

4. Describe ways in which the Sunday school may become a center of Christian activity as well as of Christian instruction.

FOR FURTHER READING

There is a splendid book on "The Lesson in Appreciation" by F. H. HAYWARD; and all the books on story-telling apply here, the best being by SARA C. BRYANT, KATHERINE D. CATHER and E. P. ST. JOHN. With respect to drill lessons, most help will be gotten from H. J. WATT'S "Economy and Training of Memory" and S. H. ROWE'S "Habit-Formation and the Science of Teaching." The thinking or problem lesson is discussed in any good modern text upon pedagogy, such as BAGLEY'S "The Educative Process," STRAYER'S "The Teaching Process" or STRAYER and NORSWORTHY'S "How to Teach," and MCMURRY'S "How to Study." The theory which underlies the application to life of the Sunday school curriculum is best stated in G. A. COE'S notable book on "A Social Theory of Religious Education," which bids fair to become a classic; and is embodied in HUGH HARTSHORNE'S "Childhood and Character" and W. L. LAWRANCE'S "The Social Emphasis in Religious Education."

CHAPTER XXIV

CLASS INSTRUCTION AND CLASS ACTIVITY

OUR ideals for the Sunday school are growing. The time was, not so long ago, when most churches were content to gather their pupils each Sunday, to be instructed for a brief period in the Uniform lesson which the International Lesson Committee had promulgated for that day, and which the teachers had studied together at some time during the previous week. The work of the Sunday school was conceived to be that of instruction merely; and the Biblical material selected for this purpose was ungraded.

To-day, the phrase "religious education" has become current among us. It stands for two ideas that are ultimately one: for the inclusion of religion in the education of our children, and for the use of educational methods in the propagation of religion from generation to generation. Churches have come to see that they have an educational as well as a religious function in the community; and that there is a sense in which they share with the public school a common task. So we have come to look upon the Sunday school as the church's school of religious education, and to expect it to match up, at least fairly well, with the public school.

The application of educational principles and standards to the work of the Sunday school, in our day, has brought about expansion in several directions. It has introduced graded lessons and graded departmental organization. It has brought better methods of instruction, and has encouraged initiative and experiment in the field of religious pedagogy. It has secured new buildings and more adequate material equipment. It has enriched the curriculum by the addition of such extra-Biblical material as is needed to fit young people to know and to do God's will in these days of world-wide missionary effort, of vast social problems and of possible social regeneration that may bring the world measurably nearer to the Kingdom of God. It has helped us to realize the necessary place of activity, as well as instruction, in the educational work of the Sunday school.

Education in general is by activity quite as much as by instruction, by training in habit as well as by the acquiring of ideas. Indeed, ideas that come just by hearsay are never quite as clear as those that are wrought out in active experience; and instruction seldom "takes" that does not rouse the pupil to some form of activity. This is preëminently true in the field of moral and religious education. We gain religion, not just by hearing and talking, reading and writing, about it, but by living as children of God. We become Christians, not merely by comprehending Christian doctrines, but by doing Christian deeds in Jesus' way.

But, it may be answered, this is nothing new. The church has long recognized this principle in dealing

with its children as well as with older folk. Within the last half-century, especially, there have sprung up within and about our churches a great many organizations for the training of children and young people in wholesome living and in the attitudes and habits of Christian service. Boys' clubs and girls' clubs of various sorts, gymnasium classes and athletic teams, junior, intermediate and senior societies of Christian Endeavor and other young people's societies of various names, temperance societies, Bands of Hope, Bands of Mercy, Boys' Brigades, Boy Scouts, Girl Scouts, Campfire Girls, Pathfinders, Bluebirds, Knights of King Arthur, Queens of Avalon, King's Daughters, mission-study groups, mission bands and missionary societies of various ages—the list might be multiplied almost indefinitely.

All this is true. The rise and prosperity of these organizations is evidence both of the inadequacy of the Sunday school's policy of mere instruction and of the church's recognition of the principle of activity. These organizations have met real needs. And they have rendered, and are rendering, splendid service to the children and young people of this land, and through them to the Kingdom of God.

But the time has come to take the next step; and churches everywhere are beginning to take it. There are limitations in the common situation where the Sunday school does nothing but instruct and the active Christian life of its pupils is shaped by these other organizations. One is that in some churches these organizations operate more or less independently, without relation to the Sunday school, and with

policies and programs determined far more by their district, state and national affiliations than by their place within the local church's educational system. Another is that these organizations may duplicate work, overlap, compete with one another, fail to observe proper age boundaries, pull at cross-purposes, or leave gaps where groups of a certain age or sex are unprovided for. The most serious limitation is that, even though the contingencies just mentioned be guarded against, this situation leaves instruction and activity sundered—the Sunday school with a program of instruction unapplied in the group life of its pupils, and the other organizations with programs of activity unrelated to the instruction which their members are receiving week after week in the Sunday school.

What is the next step? It is for the Sunday school to enlarge its educational policy and program to include activity as well as instruction; either to take over the functions of these organizations or—what may be better—to preserve their identity and retain their virtues by incorporating them into its own life as class or departmental societies, or by affiliating them with itself in whatever way may prove to be practicable; and thus to maintain a unified and consistent program of religious education, which makes possible correlated instruction and activity, impression and expression, for pupils of every grade.

Lest this be deemed to be mere theory, let me quote from the answers returned by pastors to an inquiry put by the Commission on Moral and Religious Education of one of the denominations:

"All of these organizations except the two Endeavor societies are carried on under the supervision of the Sunday school. We endeavor to coördinate and relate all the educational work of the church."

"I would have every club center about some specific group or Sunday school class, thus heading up all the young people's groups in the Sunday school, making it carry both the impressional and expressional aspects."

"Strengthen all Sunday school class organizations and clubs. Develop the social life of these and of the departments of the Sunday school until adequate provision is made for all the social needs of youth through the Sunday school. Inaugurate a perpetual campaign to enroll every member of every other organization in the Sunday school."

"Our principle is to center all social and educational work in the Sunday school, the name of which we plan to change accordingly to *Church School.*"

"For the expressional side of our classes in the middle teens and older we have organized a Sunday School Federation taking the place of the Y. P. S. C. E. Its unit of membership is not the individual but a Sunday school class with its teacher. It is working well and having a most interesting development."

The details of organization and readjustment involved in this expansion of the Sunday school's educational policy will of course vary with the local situation and its problems and opportunities. The fundamental principle is: (1) to make possible for each group of pupils not simply a social life that is whole-

some, natural and enjoyable, but opportunities for real Christian service in the measure of their ability, and guidance in meeting the actual situations and solving the problems of their own every-day world; (2) to keep this active aspect of the group's religious education in as close correlation as possible with their instruction, so that what they learn may help them to act wisely and well, and what they want to do may give them a motive for learning.

This principle involves the recognition of the Sunday school class as a natural unit of group activity as well as of group instruction. The degree to which classes should be formally organized for service depends, of course, upon the age of the pupils. There are some aspects of the pupils' activity, moreover, for which the department constitutes the better unit, and other aspects that may best be undertaken by the school as a whole. But this is only to say that the active side of the religious education of our children calls for the same fundamental forms of grouping that we have found best suited for purposes of instruction.

The principle involves the use by the various classes, to a greater or less extent, of week-day hours as well as the Sunday session. It demands teachers who are not only well-trained intellectually and devoted spiritually but possess qualities of leadership as well. But these requirements are in no sense obstacles. Churches are using week-day hours now for the active moral and religious education of their children, but according to plans that are for the most part unrelated to the instruction of the Sunday

school. The proposal is to correlate week-day and Sunday, social life and religious instruction; and to make the same person both teacher and group-leader.

Our public schools are rapidly developing new methods for the motivation of their work. By centering the pupils' reading, composition, oral language, history, geography and arithmetic about concrete projects or experiences in which the group is coöperatively interested, they bring reality and zest as well as efficiency into the classroom. The Sunday school may well learn from them at this point. Through its leadership in the active group life of its pupils it can do more than apply, it can motivate instruction. It can rouse its pupils to eager interest in what it teaches, if they can see that this has a bearing upon their projects and activities.

But what shall we do, one will ask, with that material of instruction which has no bearing upon the active life of our pupils? Its lack of bearing is pretty good evidence that it does not fit your pupils and had better be eliminated from the work of your grade. It may belong somewhere else. One of the happy results of the correlation of class instruction and class activity, we may confidently expect, will be the production in time of better-graded, more vital curricula for the Sunday school. We need nothing more right now than teachers of initiative, knowledge and good sense who are able and willing to devise plans of action and correlated courses of study for their own pupils, to try out new methods and materials, to estimate and report results, and so to aid in the revision of our present graded courses and

in the creation of new courses. Curricula, in religious as in public education, are forged by experience.

FOR INVESTIGATION AND DISCUSSION

1. Describe the changes which have been brought about in the work of the Sunday school by the application, in late years, of educational principles and standards.
2. Discuss the need, from an educational point of view, of correlating activity and instruction in the curriculum of the church's school.
3. What are some of the limitations and incoördinations involved in the common situation where the church's societies and clubs for children and young people bear no relation to the Sunday school?
4. What are some of the practical problems involved in the attempt to center education through activity as well as education by instruction in the Sunday school?
5. What principles of motivation are now being found profitable by the public schools? In what degree can the Sunday school profit from these principles, and employ like methods?
6. Are our present Sunday school curricula satisfactory? Give reasons for your answer. How can we get better curricula?

FOR FURTHER READING

For a good discussion of what the public schools are doing in this regard, read H. B. and G. M. WILSON: "The Motivation of School Work." The fundamental book on the theory of religious education, from this point of view, is G. A. COE: "A Social Theory of Religous Education"; on the practical problems of organization, W. S. ATHEARN:

"The Church School." Others well worth reading are T. W. GALLOWAY: "The Use of Motives in Teaching Morals and Religion," and W. N. HUTCHINS: "Graded Social Service in the Sunday School."